

American Sentinel, vol. 3

ESR

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1888	4
January 1888	4
"An Examination of Principles. (Concluded.)" American Sentinel 3, 1.	4
"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 1.	9
"What Does it Mean?" American Sentinel 3, 1.	11
February 1888	13
"What We Are Opposed To" American Sentinel 3, 2.	13
"Some 'Clashing Voices'" American Sentinel 3, 2.	18
"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 2.	20
"Protestant Praise of Catholicism" American Sentinel 3, 2.	22
March 1888	25
"Another Sign of the Times" American Sentinel 3, 3.	25
"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 3.	29
April 1888	33
"Front Page" American Sentinel 3, 4.	33
"National Reform Ideas of Right" American Sentinel 3, 4.	34
"Mr. Gault Speaks" American Sentinel 3, 4.	38
"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 4.	40
"Not a Christian Nation" American Sentinel 3, 4.	42
May 1888	44
"Front Page" American Sentinel 3, 5.	44
"The California Church and State Convention" American Sentinel 3, 5.	44
"An Alarm Needed" American Sentinel 3, 5.	47
"Sunday-Law Fallacies Exposed" American Sentinel 3, 5.	51
"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 5.	53
"A Deserved Rebuke" American Sentinel 3, 5.	55
June 1888	58
"Catholic Schools" American Sentinel 3, 5.	58
"An Alarming Proposition" American Sentinel 3, 5.	59
"Congress and Sunday Legislation" American Sentinel 3, 5.	64
E. J. Waggoner., "Another 'Open Letter'" American Sentinel 3, 5.	70
"National Reform in the Public Schools" American Sentinel 3, 5.	73
"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 5.	74
July 1888	79
"A Sensible Letter" American Sentinel 3, 7.	79
"The Entering Wedge" American Sentinel 3, 7.	80
ARTICLE	80
"The Church and State Bill" American Sentinel 3, 7.	85
"Religion in Japan" American Sentinel 3, 7.	92
"Very Gracious" American Sentinel 3, 7.	94
"A Word of Warning" American Sentinel 3, 7.	96
"Woman Suffrage" American Sentinel 3, 7.	98
"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 7.	101
August 1888	105
"National Reform in the South" American Sentinel 3, 8.	105
"A Calm View of National Reform" American Sentinel 3, 8.	106

“Let There Be No Alliance with Rome” American Sentinel 3, 8.	114
“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 8.	117
“A Congressman’s Opinion” American Sentinel 3, 8.	119
September 1888	122
“Civil Sabbath” American Sentinel 3, 9.	122
“Bad Institutions and Good Men” American Sentinel 3, 9.	122
“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 9.	127
October 1888	132
“Front Page” American Sentinel 3, 10.	132
“The National Sunday Bill” American Sentinel 3, 10.	133
“The National Establishment of the Christian Religion” American Sentinel 3, 10.	140
ARTICLE	140
The Savor of Tyranny	143
“The National Reform Association” American Sentinel 3, 10.	146
“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union” American Sentinel 3, 10.	150
“The Prohibition Party” American Sentinel 3, 10.	154
“Notes” American Sentinel 3, 10.	159
“Oakland Lawyers on the Blair Bills” American Sentinel 3, 10.	160
“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 10.	164
November 1888	170
“Jonathan Edwards’s Speech” American Sentinel 3, 11.	170
“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 11.	177
December 1888	183
“The Papacy in Germany” American Sentinel 3, 12.	183
“One Pope or Many?” American Sentinel 3, 12.	183
“Prohibition Blasphemy” American Sentinel 3, 12.	188
“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and Politics” American Sentinel 3, 12.	189
“The Church and State, alias the Prohibition Party” American Sentinel 3, 12.	193
“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 12.	195

1888

January 1888

“An Examination of Principles. (Concluded.)” American Sentinel 3, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

3. With the statement that “the revealed will of God is of supreme authority in civil affairs,” we also take direct issue. That the union of Church and State is a pernicious thing, is so generally conceded that National Reformers themselves are careful always to deny that their movement tends toward any such result; nevertheless the statement which we have just quoted contains the whole substance of Church and State union. For the Bible, not a part, simply, but the whole, is the revealed will of God, and is the whole of the revealed will of God; and it must be admitted that the Bible is a religious book. It was given to men for the sole purpose of teaching them the true religion. But religion and the true church are inseparable. There may be a church and not religion, but there cannot be religion and not the church. In a word, the revealed will of God is the true religion, and is the standard of the true church. Therefore, if that will should be recognized as of supreme authority in civil government, that government would be an ecclesiastical government; in other words, it would be a union of Church and State.*AMS January 1888, page 3.1*

Men may assume to take the revealed will of God as of supreme authority in civil affairs, and to oblige all men to conform to it, but in reality such a thing is impossible. For to make all men conform to the will of God would be nothing less than to make them all perfect, not only in outward actions, but in thought. The will of God, which is the law of God, requires that men shall not be angry, that they shall not indulge in the least degree of hatred or envy, that they shall not be covetous; and it declares that the harboring of such evil thoughts is just the same as the commission of outbreking sin. Now when it is stated that any document is of authority in civil affairs, it is implied that the power to enforce the provisions of that document, and to punish those who violate it, rests with the men at the head of civil

affairs. But there is no man, or set of men, who has the power to determine whether or not a man is covetous, or whether he is cherishing hatred or other evil in his heart; therefore we say that it is utterly impossible that the revealed will of God should be the authority in civil affairs. Civil government is for the purpose of keeping men civil, and not of making them moral. When it attempts to interfere in the matter of morals, it assumes prerogatives that belong to God alone.*AMS January 1888, page 3.2*

We might cite another instance which shows that to take the revealed will of God as the supreme authority in civil affairs, would be to unite Church and State. The Bible, which teaches the revealed will of God, says that it is the duty of men to believe on Christ and to be baptized. Now if National Reform ideas should be adopted, the Government would not only have the right, but it would be under obligation, to require every citizen and everyone who desired to be a citizen, to be baptized. In other words, baptism would be the evidence of naturalization, just as it is the evidence of church membership, and so the Church and the State would be identical. But it needs no argument to show that such a state of affairs would simply make hypocrites of more than ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the people.*AMS January 1888, page 3.3*

Again, the apostle Paul says: "In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." *1 Thessalonians 5:18*. It is manifestly the duty, as it is declared to be the will, of God, for everybody to give thanks for the blessings which they daily receive. Now if the revealed will of God is to be of supreme authority in civil affairs, then civil rulers must enforce that will, and compel every man in the nation to give thanks. Of course they could not compel people to give thanks privately, and that shows the folly of their claim, but they could force them to church to offer thanks nominally, or by proxy, just as people now celebrate Thanksgiving day. But such enforced thanksgiving would be mockery, and it is not the will of God that people should thank him with their lips, while their hearts are far from him.*AMS January 1888, page 3.4*

4. The second paragraph of the preamble contains a bit of sophistry and an assumption which is entirely at variance with the golden rule. It assumes that because the people who came over in the

Mayflower, for the National Reformers do not go back of that date, were professed Christians, and because the founders of the early colonies made church membership a test of citizenship, and subjected those who differed with them in belief to the same persecutions to which they had been subjected as dissenters from the ecclesiastical organization of the Old World, therefore this Government ought to be professedly a Christian Government. But when they make this argument, which is a standard plea with them, we ask them, Who was here first? Long before the arrival of the *Mayflower*, or the voyage of Columbus, this country was inhabited by powerful tribes of Indians, all of whom were pagans. Therefore if the National Reform argument were good for anything it would prove that the religion of this country should be paganism. But the argument does not amount to anything.*AMS January 1888, page 3.5*

Notice further that the assumption is that the people who first settle a country, or who are in the majority in any country, have the right to determine what religion shall be tolerated. The National Reform constitution assumes that Governments must recognize some religion, and that such State religion must of course be the religion of the majority, and that no other religion can be tolerated. According to their claim for this country, the established religion of China or India ought to be Buddhism, and that of Turkey ought to be Mohammedanism; and the rulers of those countries ought to say to the missionaries who go there from England and America: "If you do not like our institutions, and cannot conform to them, you can return to your own land; you must not think to bring your foreign customs here." If this were done, what a howl of indignation would be raised, and the National Reformers would be the very first ones to raise the cry of "persecution." We agree that it would be persecution, and unjust persecution, too; but, if the National Reform theory of majority rule be true, it is just what ought to be done. If such a course would be wrong in Turkey, how can it be right in the United States? To state the question differently, does an act which is wicked and unjust when done by a Mohammedan, become virtuous and just when done by a professed Christian?*AMS January 1888, page 3.6*

National Reformers seem to be blind to the fact that if their scheme

should prevail, and they should carry it out as they propose, making a profession of Christianity the basis of citizenship, and declaring indifference to Christ to be treason to the State, they would run directly counter to many things which they now profess to desire. For instance, they profess to be staunch friends to the native Indians, and to the Chinese who are here. They declaim loudly against the injustice that is done to both of these races, and yet if their ideas were carried out, both the Indians and the Chinese would be outlaws, and both would be subject to persecutions, by the side of which all that they have had to suffer would be considered pleasure.*AMS January 1888, page 3.7*

5. Our Government has no Christian features. The Constitution of the United States expressly forbids any religious test of any kind being required as a qualification for office or citizenship. Thus the National Reform preamble is self-contradictory, in that it speaks of the Christian features of our institutions, and the Government's connection with the Christian religion, while at the same time it admits the fact that the Constitution, which is the basis of the Government, is utterly silent concerning Christianity, or any other religion.*AMS January 1888, page 3.8*

Yet it is said that the object of this National Reform movement is "to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government." These Christian features are declared to be the reading of the Bible in our public schools, prayer in our National and State Legislatures, days of fasting and thanksgiving, etc. But the reading of the Bible in the public schools is not a feature of our Government, for there is no law requiring it; whenever it is done, it is a merely voluntary exercise. We will not here discuss the propriety of requiring the Bible to be read in the public schools, but simply call attention to the fact that it is not an existing feature of our Government, as the National Reformers claim.*AMS January 1888, page 4.1*

The same may be said of prayer in our National and State Legislatures; there is nothing obligatory in the matter, and it is only a matter of form, as anyone can testify who has ever witnessed the opening of one of these assemblies. We believe in prayer; we believe that the divine injunction to "pray without ceasing" ought to be obeyed by all men, by members of Legislatures as well as

ministers of the gospel; but we do not believe that anybody ought to be forced to pray, or to listen to prayers. And we can see no more reason for opening the State Legislatures with prayer than for merchants to open their stores with prayer. To be sure, it would be a very proper thing for the merchant to do; but he ought not to be forced to do it. But there is as yet no law requiring public prayer on any occasion, and so this is not an existing feature of our Government.*AMS January 1888, page 4.2*

6. We affirm most positively that the object of the National Reform Association, as set forth in its constitution, is not merely erroneous, but is unchristian and directly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Its object is to amend the Constitution of the United States so that it will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of "the moral laws of the Christian religion," whatever they may be. This means, in plain language, that the Constitution is to be so amended that the officers of this Government may compel everyone who desires to be a citizen to profess Christianity, and to disfranchise all others. If it does not mean this, it does not mean anything. We have the statement of National Reformers themselves that this is just what it does mean. But the Christian religion knows nothing of any such coercive measures as this. The gospel call is, "Whosoever will, let him come." The implied permission is that whosoever will not come may stay away. The ministers of Christ are simply ambassadors whose duty it is to entreat people to become reconciled to God, but who have no authority to compel any. Therefore we say that the day that sees the consummation of the National Reform designs will mark the blotting out of Christianity in this country, except among the few who will dare to dissent from such an iniquitous form of government. That national Christianity, so-called, is the enthronement of antichrist, is proved by the Dark Ages, which followed immediately upon the professed conversion of Constantine, and the lifting of Christianity to the throne of the world.*AMS January 1888, page 4.3*

We also view with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, and the immorality not only of those who are exalted to high places in the nation, but of the nation itself; but we know that politics cannot be purified nor immorality checked by legal enactment. There is only one remedy for immorality and corruption, and that is

the gospel of Jesus Christ. By this alone can men be saved either from the guilt of sin or the love of it. We do not say that the preaching of the gospel will purify politics by making politicians and all others moral men; for the Bible nowhere holds forth the hope that all men will ever repent, and it expressly declares that the righteous will ever be few in number as compared with the wicked, and that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." See *2 Timothy 3:13, Matthew 7:13, 14; 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30*, etc. But we do say that whatever of purification is ever accomplished must be solely by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.*AMS January 1888, page 4.4*

Therefore we conclude, from the very constitution of the National Reform Association, that while a large majority of its advocates may honestly desire to see a reform brought about in this country, the means by which they propose to secure it are both impolite and unscriptural, and such as would soon rid the country of what little morality it now possesses.*AMS January 1888, page 4.5*

E.J.W.

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

There is no question that is growing faster in the United States to-day than is the Sunday question. It is coming nearer and nearer to the point where it will be an essential factor in the political field. And the Christian Nation announces the intention of it all, thus:-*AMS January 1888, page 8.1*

"Let those who will remember the Sabbath to keep it holy from motives of love and obedience; the remnant must be made to do so through fear of law. We have no option."-*Christian Nation, September 28, 1887. AMS January 1888, page 8.2*

This is the National Reform version of the fourth commandment.*AMS January 1888, page 8.3*

A good many people imagine that they love law and order, when they do not. It is a fact that many, indeed the great majority of men,

are perfectly indifferent as to whether or not the laws are enforced, so long as they themselves do not suffer by their violation. Laws are enforced in this country principally from selfish motives, and not from a love of justice. There is not an abhorrence of evil because it is evil. Men will make an outcry against a crime which involves their interest, and will excuse the same if they are in no way concerned.*AMS January 1888, page 8.4*

On Sunday, October 23, the corner-stone of a Catholic college was laid in Oakland. After the ceremony, Rev. Joseph Sasia, of the Jesuit college in San Francisco, delivered a sermon on education, in which, as a matter of course, he referred to the fact that Catholic schools and churches are taxed, and that the Government does not give Catholic schools a share of the public money, and then said: "We earnestly believe that, by the blessing of Providence, our grievances will be redressed, and our just claims shall justly prevail." If the obsequiousness with which the Catholic Church is treated by the press, both political and religious, is any just indication, we may well believe that the priest will not have to wait long to see his desire fulfilled.*AMS January 1888, page 8.5*

In this number of the Sentinel we have shown how the representative California preachers proposed to secure from the Legislature the passage of a "civil" Sunday law. We confess that it does not present them in a very enviable light, but we can't help that, it is a simple statement of the facts in the case. Yet these men are no worse than the representative ministers in any other State in the Union. We have, for instance, the minutes of the Preachers' Convention, held for the same purpose precisely, in Elgin, Ill., last November, and they reach their point in the same way. The thing is fast becoming universal, and the methods are all of a piece. The trouble is that in this they are all working for legislation upon a matter that is wholly religious, and which every argument that they make proves to be wholly religious, while they try to cover it all up with the word "civil;" but the covering is too narrow for them to wrap themselves in it.*AMS January 1888, page 8.6*

The National Reformers indignantly deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, but insist that what they want is a union of Religion and the State. The Rev. Josiah Strong,

D.D., General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, and author of the well-known book, "Our Country," has expressed himself to the same effect. He, with the National Reformers, wants not Church and State, but Religion and State. Says Dr. Strong, "I distinguish, as some apparently do not, between Church and Religion." *AMS January 1888, page 8.7*

Now we think we know enough about mathematics to work out so simple a problem as is here presented. The three terms are these, the State, the Church, and Religion. They say that they design to keep Church and State forever separate and distinct, but that Religion and State must be closely united. The result of our calculation is that if they succeed in their design they will necessarily have to divorce the Church and Religion. If this solution is not correct, we should be glad if someone would point out the defect in our calculation. We verily believe that when the National Reformers, and their many friends who do not go by that name, shall have accomplished their purpose, no one of acute perception will have any difficulty in distinguishing between Church and Religion. There may be a form of Religion but the power will have fled forever. *AMS January 1888, page 8.8*

"What Does it Mean?" American Sentinel 3, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

What means this almost universal uprising over the question of "How shall our American Christian civil Sunday sabbath be preserved?" Large Conventions of ecclesiastics are held solely to discuss this question. The W.C.T.U. works it up all over the United States. Prohibition Conventions put it in their platforms. The leading preachers and lecturers of the Nation discuss it from pulpit and platform. Legislatures, both State and National, from beginning to end of their sessions, are petitioned for the enactment of stringent laws in its behalf. The religious papers of the country lift up one united cry that it must and shall be preserved. Knights of Labor, and workingmen's unions, and socialists, call loudly for laws enforcing its observance. Political Conventions are "worked" and Legislatures are "lobbied" in the interests of the Christian Sunday. Saloon-keepers enforce laws for its observance. Only a few years ago

there was no sign of any such thing, and even those who now make the most of it, then insisted that it was one of the least of the questions that concerned religion. But now, instead of its being the least and most incidental of the questions of religion, it is by their own confession the greatest and most urgent of all. Now, instead of the question of how to reach the masses with the gospel being the greater, that question must take a back seat, while there comes to the front the universal demand for stringent Sunday laws strictly enforced, that by this means the masses may be reached. Now instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking the far greater precedence, it has come to this, that if you don't favor Sunday laws you are an infidel, and if you oppose them you are an atheist. Now, instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking precedence, it has come to pass that the question of the Sunday sabbath is made the test of fidelity and theism. Yet in "demanding" laws to compel everybody to observe the day, and submit to the test, they will gravely argue that the movement is entirely civil, and that there is nothing religious about it.*AMS January 1888, page 8.9*

What, then, does all this mean? It means that, through this question of compulsory Sunday observance, the civil power is to be subordinated to the ecclesiastical in these United States. We know that this statement will be pooh-poohed by many, and especially by those who are working for it, but in making the statement we but speak forth the words of truth and soberness. This is precisely the way in which the civil power was subordinated to the religious, in the fourth century, out of which came the tyranny of the Papacy; and both time and events will shortly demonstrate that we state the exact truth. Therefore, without hesitation, we lift up our voice against the whole scheme. To laugh at the fears of the Sentinel will not avert the evil. To despise its warnings is only to rivet your own chains. In perfect sincerity the American Sentinel adopts the memorable words, "I am in earnest-I will not equivocate-I will not excuse-I will not retreat a single inch-and *I will be heard.*"*AMS January 1888, page 8.10*

February 1888

“What We Are Opposed To” American Sentinel 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

At various times the Reformed Presbyterian Church has been referred to in the columns of the Sentinel, and the statement has been made that the principles of the National Reform Association are those of that church, and that if the National Reform movement becomes a success, the Government of the United States will virtually be a Reformed Presbyterian Government. A worthy member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church has taken exception to this statement, and thinks that we are doing an injustice to that church, by making such statements. Certainly no injustice was intended, and the Sentinel has never designed to cast any reflections on that church. The statements were made simply for the purpose of showing that the success of the National Reform movement will effect a virtual union of Church and State.*AMS February 1888, page 10.1*

These statements were not made at random, nor were they unfortified by proofs. For proof that National Reform and Reformed Presbyterianism are the same in principle, we have the following explicit declaration of Rev. James Wallace, in the *Reformed Presbyterian* of January, 1870.*AMS February 1888, page 10.2*

“The principles of National Reform are our principles, and its work is our work. *National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the Nation.*”*AMS February 1888, page 10.3*

The italics are Mr. Wallace’s. Now we submit to the candid reader that we cannot justly be accused of false witness in saying that National Reform is nothing but Reformed Presbyterianism, when we but quote the words of a minister of that denomination, as published in the church organ. Other evidence has been given to the same effect, but this is sufficient. Until the Reformed Presbyterian Synod shall declare that Rev. James Wallace did not correctly represent that church, in the *Reformed Presbyterian* of January, 1870, we

cannot retract anything on that score.*AMS February 1888, page 10.4*

Now as to the statement that the Covenanter or Reformed Presbyterian Church was founded upon the principles of Church and State union. The “Encyclopedia Britannica” says:*AMS February 1888, page 10.5*

“Covenanters, in Scottish history, the name applied to a party, embracing the great majority of the people, who, during the seventeenth century, bound themselves to establish and maintain the Presbyterian doctrine and polity as the sole religion of the country, to the exclusion of prelacy and popery.”*AMS February 1888, page 10.6*

But there is still stronger testimony, namely, that of the Covenanters themselves. Before giving it, we will quote, as an introduction, the following brief statements of history:*AMS February 1888, page 10.7*

“In 1581 the General Assembly of Scotland adopted a confession of faith, or national covenant drawn up by John Craig, condemning episcopal government, under the name of hierarchy. This covenant was signed by James I., and enjoined on all his subjects. It was again subscribed in 1590 and 1596. The subscription was renewed in 1638, and the subscribers engaged by oath to maintain religion in the same state in which it existed in 1580, and to reject all innovations introduced since that time. This oath annexed to the confession of faith of 1581, received the name of the National Covenant.”-*Art. Covenanters.AMS February 1888, page 10.8*

Now read the following act which was passed with reference to the above-mentioned National Covenant:-*AMS February 1888, page 10.9*

“Assembly at Edinburg, August 30, 1639, Sess. 23.*AMS February 1888, page 10.10*

“*Act Ordaining, by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant with the Assembly’s Declaration.AMS February 1888, page 10.11*

“The General Assembly considering the great happiness which may flow from a full and perfect union of this kirk and kingdom, by joining of all in one and the same covenant with God, with the King’s Majesty, and amongst ourselves; having, by our great oath, declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings; and having withal supplicated his Majesty’s High Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty’s honorable Privy Council, to enjoin, by act of Council, all the lieges in time coming to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Covenant; which, as a testimony of our fidelity to God, and loyalty to our king, we have subscribed: And seeing his Majesty’s High Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty’s honorable Privy Council, have granted the desire of our supplication, ordaining, by civil authority, all his Majesty’s lieges, in time coming, to subscribe the foresaid Covenant: *that our union may be the more full and perfect*, we, by our act and constitution ecclesiastical, do approve the foresaid Covenant in all the heads and clauses thereof; and ordain of new, under all ecclesiastical censure, That all the masters of universities, colleges, and schools, all scholars at the passing of their degrees, all persons suspected of Papistry, *or any other error*, and finally, all the members of this kirk and kingdom, subscribe the same, with these words prefixed to their subscription, ‘The Article of this Covenant, which was at the first subscription referred to the determination of the General Assembly, being determined; and thereby the five articles of Perth, the government of the kirk by bishops, the civil places and power of kirkmen, upon the reasons and grounds contained in the acts of the General Assembly, declared to be unlawful within this kirk; we subscribe according to the determination foresaid.’ And ordain the Covenant, with this declaration, to be inserted in the registers of the Assemblies of this kirk, general, provincial, and presbyterial, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. And in all humility supplicate his Majesty’s High Commissioner, and the honorable Estates of Parliament, by their authority, to ratify and enjoin the same, under all civil pains; which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King’s Majesty’s honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom.”*AMS February 1888, page 10.12*

This will suffice to show that we have not erred in saying that the principles of National Reform and those of Reformed

Presbyterianism are the same, that Reformed Presbyterianism was founded upon the principles of Church and State union, and that as a consequence the real end of the National Reform movement must be a union of Church and State. And this is the sole object that we had in view. Our reference to the Reformed Presbyterian Church was only incidental to the argument that National Reform success must be Church and State union. In nothing that has been said in these columns has there been any design to cast reflections upon the Reformed Presbyterian Church. The Sentinel has no quarrel with any religious body; it is no part of its work to oppose even what seem to be errors of doctrine. It has no time nor space to devote to the discussion of creeds and confessions of faith. Its sole object is to oppose "anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact," and to work for the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious,-including the rights of infidels as well as of Christians, realizing that both are human.*AMS February 1888, page 10.13*

This being the case, it would manifestly be turning aside from our legitimate work to discuss denominational matters. The Sentinel freely grants that the Reformed Presbyterian Church has been active in reforms in this country. We believe the members of that church to be as pious and God-fearing as those of any other; and for those whose intimate acquaintance we have formed, we have the most sincere respect. But this does not in the least abate our opposition to its principles being incorporated into this Government.*AMS February 1888, page 11.1*

The Covenanters did indeed protest against union of Church and State, but it was only the union of the State with the Catholic Church. They, honestly enough, supposed that the evils of Church and State union arose from the corruption of the church which was a party to that union, and that if the church were only pure, and its polity correct, no evil, but only good, could come from its union with the State. They did not perceive that union of Church and State to any degree whatever is in itself an evil, no matter how pure the church may be, and that, in fact, a union of the purest church with the State, must, if long continued, result in the deterioration of that church; but such is the case.*AMS February 1888, page 11.2*

Moreover such union cannot but result in the oppression of those who dissent from the principles of the church. This oppression is not due to the fact that those who are instrumental in bringing it about are worse than other people, but from the necessities of the situation. In fact, men who are personally upright are more apt than any other class to start such oppression, for they are the ones who are zealous for the enforcement of the law. Now when ecclesiastical usages are enjoined by civil law, and those usages are disregarded, such disregard becomes a crime, and the offenders must be punished. Thus religious persecution is started simply from a desire to see the Government honored by the enforcement of its laws. If the offenders would at once submit, there would be no persecution, and the good men (and women) who seek to enforce such laws, do not design that there shall be any. But the trouble is, many of these dissenters will be so stubborn as to persist in disregarding the ecclesiastico-civil laws, and so more severe measures than were at first contemplated are found necessary, and there will be enough "lewd fellows of the baser sort" to carry out through innate malice, what was conscientiously begun. And no matter how severely the persecution may rage, it will be only the simple execution of the laws.*AMS February 1888, page 11.3*

For the benefit of any who may think that our opposition to National Reform is due to antagonism to religion, we will say that the editors of the Sentinel are all members of an evangelical church, but if there should arise a species of National Reform proposing to enforce the usages of their church, they would oppose it as strenuously as they do the present movement. We honor Christ as the divine Word by whom the worlds were made, and the Redeemer of mankind; but we would oppose a movement to make such an acknowledgement a test of citizenship, just as strongly as we would oppose a law enjoining a belief in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, or making auricular confession obligatory. In short, we are opposed to any union of the State with a corrupt church, because such union would result in religious persecution; and we are opposed to any union with a pure church, because in addition to religious persecution there would result a corruption of the church.*AMS February 1888, page 11.4*

E.J.W.

“Some ‘Clashing Voices’” American Sentinel 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

At the celebration of the Centennial of the Constitution of the United States, in Philadelphia, President Cleveland said:*AMS February 1888, page 13.1*

“Does anyone doubt to-day that the Constitution of one hundred years ago was well made, and that the work was well done?”*AMS February 1888, page 13.2*

Against this, Mr. Gault, whose special *forte* seem to be to come in conflict with everything that is reasonable and true, makes his voice to clash as follows:-*AMS February 1888, page 13.3*

“We not only doubt, but in the light of past history we are sure that work was not well done. At least two very serious mistakes our fathers made in that Constitution. One was the enslavement of one-sixth of our population, because they had black skin. The other was the substitution of the popular will for the will of God. At the cost of the civil war we have corrected the first, and the signs of the times indicate that we may be compelled to correct the second at even a dearer price.”*AMS February 1888, page 13.4*

One would expect that a man occupying so prominent a position as Mr. Gault does in an association whose sole object is to patch up the Constitution of the United States, would be well acquainted with that document; but we have never seen any evidence that he has ever read it. If he can find in that document, as it was adopted in 1787, anything favoring the enslavement of anybody, he will find what the framers of it could not.*AMS February 1888, page 13.5*

But a little thing like that amounts to nothing in comparison with the cool manner in which this representative of National Reform declares the expectations of that association to plunge this country into a war greater than our civil war, if their ideas are not complied with otherwise. We don't suppose that they have the power to do anything of the kind, but that they have the will is evident enough. And yet they have the assurance to try to make us believe that if they once got the Constitution and laws fixed to suit themselves,

they would not persecute any who might not agree with them. If they are willing to stir up a civil war involving the Nation, in order to secure their religious amendment, would they tolerate opposition by a handful of men after it was secured? The question answers itself.*AMS February 1888, page 13.6*

In the same number of the *Statesman*, that of December 22, 1887, there is the following statement by Wm. Smith, a lawyer of Janesville, Wis.:*AMS February 1888, page 13.7*

“By putting a ‘God in the Constitution’ plank in the Prohibition platform, you rule me out of that party. I am not opposed to prohibition, but I am opposed to God in the Constitution.”*AMS February 1888, page 13.8*

With this Mr. Gault makes his voice to clash in the following strain:*AMS February 1888, page 13.9*

“How can you be an honest prohibitionist when you want a law with only the fallible, changing, conflicting will of the people behind it, in preference to a law having behind it, first, divine authority, next human, next the fear of hell. That is the only kind of a law that will bind the conscience. Prohibition legislation, or any other legislation, will have little force until we base it on a law that is the will of an unchanging Law-giver.”*AMS February 1888, page 13.10*

Well, what next? “Upon what meat hath this our Cæsar fed, that he hath grown so great?” We have heard of some pretty rigid enforcement of the prohibitory laws of Iowa and Kansas, that have behind them “only the fallible, changing, conflicting will of the people;” but such enforcement will not satisfy National Reformers. Nothing will do but they must have laws that will send a man to hell if he violates them! This is just what Mr. Gault’s language implies; for how could there be “the fear of hell” behind a law, if that law did not threaten to send its violators to hell? Mr. Gault doesn’t say who he expects will execute this penalty in the National Reform Government; but since the makers of a law have the power to execute, we suppose that the National Reformers themselves will consider themselves the duly appointed ministers of divine wrath. And yet they tell us that they never could think of persecuting anybody.*AMS February 1888, page 13.11*

Perhaps someone may think that we are extravagant in our conclusions. We know that we are not. It may be that Mr. Gault is an irresponsible person, not competent to speak for National Reformers as a class; if so we hope the Statesman will let us know, and we will never again pay the slightest attention to any statement that he may make. But leaving Mr. Gault out of the question, National Reform teaching does actually place in the hands of the rulers of the proposed National Reform Government, the power, not only to kill the body, but to consign the soul to hell. Here is the proof.*AMS February 1888, page 13.12*

They claim that the triumph of their movement, will be the setting up of the kingdom of Christ on earth. They apply the Scriptures that speak of the glorious reign of Christ over his enemies, to the time when God is acknowledged in the Constitution. They do not expect that Christ will come and reign personally, and in that case the men at the head of affairs will be his vicegerents. Thus we shall have an American Papacy, and everybody knows, that the Pope of Rome claims power to open and shut Heaven, and to consign souls to hell.*AMS February 1888, page 14.1*

Whether they expect Christ to reign personally or not, the result will be the same. We have already quoted from the *Statesman* the statement that the time is coming when those who will not have Christ to rule over them shall be slain before him; and this statement was made with direct reference to those who refuse to accept the National Reform *regime*. We say in all seriousness the day that marks the success of the National Reform movement, will mark the inauguration of a period of grievous persecution. We may be called alarmists. That is all right; it is just what we are. It is the sentinel's duty to sound an alarm when danger is near. If people will only prepare to meet the danger, we care not by what name we may be called.*AMS February 1888, page 14.2*

E.J.W.

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

About two months ago we made the statement and proved it that the National Reform Association is running in its list of Vice-Presidents the names of men who are dead and who have been dead for years. Since writing that we have received additional evidence in proof of this statement. We have these proofs in writing and signed by disinterested and authoritative persons. But, anything at all to win, is the principle upon which these National "Reformers" work.*AMS February 1888, page 16.1*

It is with pain that the *Congregationalist* notices an increasing tendency to disregard the sanctity of Sunday. It cites "for example" an account of "a great train load of the Grand Army which drew out of one of the Chicago stations on a Sunday morning, on its way to St. Louis," and then says:-*AMS February 1888, page 16.2*

"Doubtless there was a considerable sprinkling of church members among these Sunday travelers, whose consciences were not quite at ease over what they were doing."*AMS February 1888, page 16.3*

Yes, "doubtless" that is so. Therefore, by all means, let the civil authority of the Nation come to the rescue, and entirely ease the consciences of these Sunday Christians by the enforcement of a rigid, uncompromising Sunday law, that shall compel these church members to do, as church members, what they have not conscience enough to do otherwise. Only let the civil law supply the place of conscience in all these people, then they will all serve the Lord.*AMS February 1888, page 16.4*

Let it be understood that it is not the man who talks the most about honoring Christ, who really does honor him. Said Jesus, to some who were profuse in their professions, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord and do not the things which I say?" A humble life of self-denial, patterned after the divine model, and filled, like his, with good deeds, is the only way that Christ can be honored. When Christ was on earth, he resisted every attempt to bestow upon him political honors; and he is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Those who loudly proclaim their loyalty to Christ, and long for power to cut off those who do not acknowledge him, are in the same condition that Peter was on the night when he cut off the ear of the high priest's servant, or of the two disciples who wished to call

down fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans. Our desire for them is that, like those disciples, they may see the manner of spirit that they are of, and may become true followers of Jesus.*AMS February 1888, page 16.5*

Speaking of that political preachers' committee that was lately appointed in New York, the *Christian Nation* says that "Archbishop Corrigan will be invited to serve on it." We can inform the Christian Nation now and even at this distance that Archbishop Corrigan will not "serve" on the committee. Catholic Archbishops don't serve Protestants in any capacity whatever. In fact they don't serve anything or anybody but the Cardinals and the Pope. They may get archbishop Corrigan to rule on the committee, but it is a settled thing that he will never serve there. There is another reason for this too. No Catholic Archbishop in Christendom would ever consent to receive, from Protestant preachers, instruction or guidance in political workings; and this for the simple reason that there is not one of them who does not know more on that subject than all the Protestant preachers, together ever knew. There is not a Catholic priest in New York City who could not at a moment's notice give those preachers more "pointers" in their political scheme than they ever dreamed of. The Archbishop may consent to help them along, but it is certain that he will never do it in the form of a servant.*AMS February 1888, page 16.6*

"Protestant Praise of Catholicism" American Sentinel 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Independent*, one of the most well-known and influential religious journals in the world, gushes after the following style over the Pope's Jubilee:-*AMS February 1888, page 16.7*

"To Joachim Vincent Pecci, Bishop of Rome, and Pope of the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Catholic Church, health and an evangelical benediction! A priest of blameless life for fifty years, wise, moderate, successful as priest, governor, archbishop, nuncio, cardinal, Pope, we send him our Christian salutation. Prelates, priests, and peoples of his own communion, gladly pay him homage. We simply offer him kindly greetings in the name of Christ,

to whom both Pope and Protestant bow in reverent adoration. Gifts and congratulations pour in upon him from Christian, Turk, and pagan, in honor of the jubilee of his priesthood... The time was when Popes hurled their unapostolic anathemas against followers of Christ, and Protestants hurled them back with access of intensity, if possible. But Leo XIII. is a kindly Christian gentleman, who loves light and peace and purity and progress. *Lumen in Coelo* is his motto; and that his reign will be as a light in the Catholic heavens, is in no wise improbable. He has been Pope just ten years, and these years have been so many years of progress for his church... He has made peace with France and Germany and Switzerland; he has brought about an era of better feeling in Italy, he has reformed many abuses, raised the tone of the church, and gained a strong influence in the councils of Europe... And so we wish Pope Leo, of that name the thirteenth, continued health, a long reign, and God-speed in his liberalizing policy.”*AMS February 1888, page 16.8*

Can our readers believe that the above, and considerable more of the same, is from a professedly Protestant journal? Where is the Protestantism? What is said about the prosperity of the church, and the progress of its influence, under Leo XIII., is all true; but is that something to rejoice over? If in time of war, a leader on one side should report with every appearance of joy, that since General X had taken command of the enemy’s forces, they had made rapid and continual progress, would he not be considered as harboring traitorous feelings toward his own country? Let it be remembered that the liberties of the people have never ruled, and that the triumph of Catholicism always means death to civil and religious liberty.”*AMS February 1888, page 16.9*

We have no fear that the Pope will ever be regarded in this country as he is in Europe, or that the Catholic Church, as such, will ever gain the supremacy in the United States; but what we do fear, and with good reason, is that Protestantism will become so saturated with the principles of Catholicism as to overthrow the liberties of the American people. We do not mean that Protestantism will ever pray to the virgin Mary, or adopt the confessional, or any other Romish dogma that it has not now, but that it will become intoxicated with the lust for power, which is the distinguishing characteristic of Romanism. Catholicism, stripped of its belief that the church should

be recognized as supreme in politics, as well as in religion, would be nothing to be feared. If there is to be a union of religion and State, as the National Reformers now put it, we would just as willingly see the Catholic religion elevated to that position as the Protestant. The American people do well to look out for the encroachments of the Papacy; but we fear lest while they are watching the enemy that is approaching from Rome, degenerate Protestantism will steal a march on them and gain the citadel of their liberties.*AMS February 1888, page 16.10*

March 1888

“‘Another Sign of the Times’” *American Sentinel* 3, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Under this heading, the *Christian Union* of January 26 has an article about the Pope's jubilee, from which we make the following extracts:-*AMS March 1888, page 21.1*

“Nothing shows more clearly the decay of old religious animosities than the fact that so little has been heard of late of the old anti-Popery cry... The old and somewhat panicky feeling which Protestants used to entertain toward the Pope and the church has evidently passed away. If evidence of this were needed, it would be found in the fact that the President's gift of a copy of the Constitution of the United States to the Pope has for the most part passed unchallenged-has, indeed, been commended as an act of courtesy, and as a sensible way of discharging what was, under the circumstances, a matter of national obligation; for as the author of ‘Religio Medici’ long ago suggested, the Pope is a temporal prince, and the amenities which are paid to princes are due to him. ...In England, where the anti-Popery feeling has been even more rabid than in this country, an English nobleman of the highest rank has recently conveyed to the Pope the personal sympathy and good-will of the Queen, and was instructed ‘to give expression to her feeling of deep respect for the elevated character and Christian wisdom’ which the Supreme Pontiff has displayed in his high position. ‘The temperate sagacity,’ said the envoy, ‘with which your Holiness has corrected errors and differences, from which much evil might otherwise have arisen, inspires her Majesty with the earnest hope that life and health may long be granted to you, and that your beneficent actions may long be continued.’”*AMS March 1888, page 21.2*

After mentioning the events connected with the Pope's jubilee, and the brilliancy of the pontifical mass in St. Peter's, the editorial continues:-*AMS March 1888, page 21.3*

“Among the almost countless congratulations that were received

from all parts of the world, Protestant good wishes and congratulations mingled with those from Catholic sources. This is as it should be, and marks the coming of the better age in which the bitter and unchristian animosities of the past are disappearing as the shadows at the dawn.*AMS March 1888, page 21.4*

“One may hold Protestant convictions as resolutely as his fathers held them, and may op-pose the Catholic propaganda in Church and State with the greatest zeal and earnestness, and still preserve toward this church that attitude of Christian courtesy which ought to be, although it never yet has been, the characteristic of Christian peoples. It is not impossible that the time may come when the old antagonism of the Catholic and the Protestant may appear insignificant in view of the deeper antagonisms which shall make them essentially one. Thomas Carlyle declared that the real struggle in every age is between the believer and the unbeliever, and it has seemed at times of late as if this phrase might soon describe the practical issue of certain tendencies in modern society. For anarchism and social disorder of the radical kind have their roots in atheism, and it is quite possible that the time may come when the real issue will be between the theist and the atheist; the man who believes in God, and order, and freedom, and rights of per-son, and property on the one side, and the man who disbelieves in all these on the other side. Whenever that time comes, the Protestant and the Catholic will stand side by side in a common defense of those common beliefs which have been their mutual possessions these many centuries. Stranger things have happened in history than such a change of attitude as would be involved in the fellowship of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant; and it is well to remember in any event that the only Christian way to hold one’s convictions is to hold them with charity and courtesy.”*AMS March 1888, page 21.5*

Can anybody give a reason for this change in the feeling of Protestants toward Catholicism? Was it all just a senseless “panicky feeling,” when the Waldenses and Albigenses used to tremble at the approach of the minions of the Pope? Was Luther’s feeling toward the Pope nothing but jealousy? Did Huss and Herome, and tens of thousands of others whom we call martyrs,-did they commit suicide? Was it foolish superstition on the part of the Lollards, when

they used every means in their power to conceal their Bibles, so that the agents of the Pope might not burn them? In short, must we say that the Reformation was a mistake, and that the men who stood so firmly for principle were nothing but cranks? If not, why should there be any change in feeling towards Rome? She has not changed at all. Leo XIII. believes every dogma that the church has ever put forth, and he believes that every one of his predecessors in the Papal chair was infallible, and could not do wrong. What is it, then, but that he would do the same things if circumstances seemed to make it necessary, and he had the power?*AMS March 1888, page 21.6*

When we remember the record which Rome has made, it is startling to read in an influential Protestant journal that “the Pope is a temporal prince, and the amenities which are paid to princes are due to him.” And it is still more startling to learn that almost every Nation is giving practical evidence of its belief in this statement. Someone may say, “Oh, it is not because they favor Catholicism; they do it simply from political motives.” Of course; nations and their rulers never take any steps except from political motives; and the Roman Catholic Church is simply a vast political machine, and therein lies the danger from it. We have no fears that Protestant America will ever turn Catholic in name; but when Protestants cease to protest, they might as well be Catholics. We hold that Protestantism to-day ought to stand in the same relation to Catholicism that it did in the days of the Reformation. That does not mean that we should hate Catholics, or that we should have any feelings towards them other than those of Christian charity and courtesy; but it does mean that we should protest against the principles and practices of the Church of Rome, and not be dazzled by its display of wealth and power.*AMS March 1888, page 22.1*

We said above that ‘it is startling to read in an influential Protestant journal that the Pope is a temporal prince, and the amenities which are paid to princes are due to him.’ “But we don’t read such language in a Protestant journal. Protestant journals do not contemplate a union of Protestantism and Catholicism. The *Christian Union* is not a Protestant journal; and the fact that it is an influential journal, and that other professedly Protestant journals, as the *New York Independent*, and *Christian at Work*, stand in the

same position, is evidence to us that there is very little Protestantism nowadays.*AMS March 1888, page 22.2*

Let the reader read carefully the last paragraph of the *Christian Union's* article. Note the following sentences: "It is not impossible that the time may come when the old antagonism of the Catholic and the Protestant may appear in-significant in view of the deeper antagonism which shall make them essentially one." "Stranger things have happened in history than such a change in attitude as would be involved in the fellowship of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant." Stranger things have happened, and no doubt this will happen; but the man who can calmly contemplate such an event, has not read the history of the middle ages, or has read it to little purpose. But what can be said of the one who can deliberately bid for such a union with Roman Catholicism?*AMS March 1888, page 22.3*

The nations of the Old World are nearly all now virtually at the feet of the Pope. They have been brought there through policy. Germany repealed the May Laws, and made friends with the Pope, in order to secure his help in the struggle with the socialists. Russia wants his help to settle her internal dissensions; and England must have him as mediator in the trouble with Ireland. We have not the slightest doubt but that in a few years Protestantism and Catholicism will be virtually one in crushing out "atheism." And who will be classed among the atheists? The Christian Statesman has already told us,-every man who opposes the National Reform attempt to enforce the observance of Sunday. He may believe in God, in Jesus Christ, and the gospel, and in the Bible, but if he keeps the fourth commandment just as it reads, instead of keeping it as interpreted by the church, he will be counted an atheist. In short, every man who insists upon the right of private judgment in matters of religion, will be classed among the atheists.*AMS March 1888, page 22.4*

And this is what is actually coming to pass in this country. The spirit of it is everywhere. We wish to again emphasize the fact that the Sentinel is uncompromisingly opposed to everything like a union of Church and State; whether in name or in fact. We do not stand opposed simply to the so-called National Reform movement. Those

who are looking at that alone, will be terribly surprised some day. We warn the people of America that degenerate Protestantism, which comprises nearly all the Protestantism that now exists, is about to sell their liberty to the Church of Rome. Let every true man keep his eyes open to discern the signs of the times.*AMS March 1888, page 22.5*

E.J.W.

“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The American Sentinel is, as everybody can see, only an eight-page paper, and is issued only once a month. It is evident, therefore, that we cannot publish everything, nor can we print in one number everything that comes within our province. When people send us communications, or extracts from papers, they must have patience if they do not appear at once. “All things come ‘round to him who will but wait.”*AMS March 1888, page 24.1*

“Friend, please stop the American Sentinel,” was the word that came post haste from Kansas a few days ago. We have not the slightest doubt but that there are many who would like to have us stop the Sentinel, but we cannot gratify them, because there are so very many who write of the Sentinel in a strain similar to the following from a prominent judge in a Southern State: “I read each number that comes, and I think with increasing interest.” The Sentinel will not stop.*AMS March 1888, page 24.2*

The Sentinel has not space to waste in personalities. It is opposed not to National Reformers, but to national Reform. Our friend N.R. Johnston enters a grievous complaint against us in the last number of the Statesman, because a certain article of his was not published in the Sentinel. As he says, we have published one or two articles from him. We went so far as to agree to publish them, before we saw them, because we felt sure that he would confine himself to the main points. So when he again asked for space, we again assented; but when we found that the most of one of the articles needed no reply, and was not really upon National Reform, we

informed him that we had not space for it. We would have published one; but as he insisted that it must be both or none, we returned both. At the same time we informed him that whenever he would furnish us with straight National Reform matter, we would publish it. This he does not tell the readers of the *Statesman*.*AMS March 1888, page 24.3*

We make this note of explanation simply that all may know that the Sentinel does not intend to shut out free and fair discussion of National Reform principles from its columns. Nothing would please us better than to receive for every number, from any representative National Reformer, short, pithy articles on National Reform, telling our readers just what National Reform is, and what it wants. This doesn't mean, though, that we propose to resign the editorial management of the Sentinel into the hands of the National Reformers.*AMS March 1888, page 24.4*

The November (1887) number of the Sentinel contained some of the questions and answers given at the Lakeside National Reform Convention. Among them was one by Dr. McAllister, in which he was reported as saying, in answer to the question if the success of National Reform would not result in persecution: "False religion will be persecuted, and the State will be the persecutor." Mr. McAllister says that what he did say was that "a false religion will persecute." We very gladly make the correction, for we have no design to misrepresent anybody. The truth about the National Reform Association is more damaging to it than any erroneous statement could be. When we have more space than we have in this number, we shall notice Mr. McAllister's statement more at length.*AMS March 1888, page 24.5*

"District" Secretary, Rev. M.A. Gault, in a report in the Christian Statesman of August 11, tells of his attendance at a Prohibition convention at Lake Side Rink, Racine, Wis., at which he "had the privilege of presenting the cause of God in Government here on the same platform with Colonel Bain, and Governor St. John." Speaking further of Colonel Bain he says:-*AMS March 1888, page 24.6*

"He shook my hand warmly as I left the plat-form, saying how much he sympathized with the National Reform movement. He said he

had received a letter some time ago from the editor of the American Sentinel in California, telling him how much mischief there was in our movement, and asking him to write some articles for the Sentinel.”*AMS March 1888, page 24.7*

We are most happy to inform Mr. Bain that he is most prodigiously mistaken. We know that Mr. Bain never received a letter from the editor of the American Sentinel, because we happen to know that the editor of the Sentinel never sent him a letter. Nor did the editor of the American Sentinel, nor any person authorized by the editor of the Sentinel, ever ask Colonel Bain to write a single article, much less “some articles for the Sentinel.” We would suggest that the excellent Colonel read his letters a little more carefully.*AMS March 1888, page 24.8*

Further Mr. Gault says of him:-*AMS March 1888, page 24.9*

“He wrote in reply [to the letter that he didn’t get from the editor of the Sentinel] that our country had been drifting devilward long enough, and he was disposed to sympathize with any movement to help it. Godward.”*AMS March 1888, page 24.10*

Mr. Bain may have written such a letter to somebody; he may have written it to the editor of the Sentinel; but that no such letter was ever received by us is certain. If we had received it we might have said to him that it is true enough that our country has been, and is, “drifting devilward,” but whereas now it is only “drifting,” the effect of National Reform will be but to set it full-sail in that direction.*AMS March 1888, page 24.11*

Hitherto the Sentinel has used the phrase “union of Church and State’ in calling attention to the rapid encroachments of the ecclesiastical upon the civil power in this country and in making known our opposition to it. But those who are zealously working for the union of Church and State here, constantly seek to dodge, and to deaden as far as possible, the force of the Sentinel’s arguments, by the sophistical plea that they are “all thoroughly opposed to any union of Church and State,” while at the same time they are all just as thoroughly in favor of a union of Religion and the State. “Church and State,” say they, “is always an unmixed evil. But Religion and State is another thing. That is a good thing,-and that is what we aim

to make a feature of our institutions, and we are going to have it." *AMS March 1888, page 24.12*

Now the Sentinel does not propose to work at cross purposes, neither does it intend to spend any time in drawing hair-splitting distinctions between terms, therefore let it be forever understood that the American Sentinel is uncompromisingly opposed to any union of Religion and the State. For such a union can end only in the worst of all tyrannies-the tyranny of a religious despotism. In reality there is no difference, of course, between a union of Church and State and a union of Religion and the State, but as those who favor the wicked thing, endeavor to disguise it under the apparently mellow term "Religion and State," we, likewise, in exposing it, shall hereafter use that term rather than the phrase "Church and State." This, not because we admit for a moment that there is any difference at all, but solely to prevent them from dodging our arguments. But let it be understood that our opposition to so-called Religion and the State, is due solely to our love for true religion and the individual. *AMS March 1888, page 24.13*

April 1888

“Front Page” American Sentinel 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

“And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar’s, and unto God the things which be God’s.”*AMS April 1888, page 25.1*

The New York *Independent* notes and comments as follows:-*AMS April 1888, page 25.2*

“‘The present worthless school system,’ is what the *Freeman’s Journal* calls our scheme of public education. If the Roman Catholics insist on destroying this system, they will have to destroy the Nation to succeed.”*AMS April 1888, page 25.3*

Oh, no, they will not! All they will have to do to succeed is to wait a little while till the National Reform Association shall have gained the support and the influence of a few more Protestant leaders, and then to accept the persistently proffered alliance of the Association, and the work will be done; the system will then soon and easily be destroyed. But then, having succeeded, the Nation will soon be destroyed. The *Independent* is right as to results; it had only misplaced the items. They will not have to destroy the Nation to succeed in destroying our public-school system. But having succeeded in destroying our public-school system, the destruction of the Nation will soon follow.*AMS April 1888, page 25.4*

Mr. “Sam” Small has acquired a national reputation, and a very extensive influence, as a religious worker. Against this in itself, or in its legitimate exercise, we have not a word to say. But when he essays to use his influence in the line of things set forth in the following proposition, then we most decidedly object. Says Mr. Small:-*AMS April 1888, page 25.5*

“I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue

their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws.”*AMS April 1888, page 25.6*

And that will be but the Papacy over again. From the way things are now going we have no doubt that Mr. Small as well as the rest of us will see that day come. And when it does come it will be the most woeful day the Nation will have ever seen; and the utter ruin of the whole national fabric will then be but a question of a little while.*AMS April 1888, page 25.7*

“National Reform Ideas of Right” American Sentinel 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The following extract is National Reform doctrine in its purest form, from the pen of one of its best representatives:-*AMS April 1888, page 28.1*

“A Christian people, adopting and ad-ministering a government that we would call Christian, might legislate about religion as well as about morals or education or temperance. To do so would not unite Church with State. Illustrations will be in place here. A Christian people might enact that any man who would blaspheme or curse God should be punished. If all the people of the United States were Christians, and they should be, they would do right in passing a law, Congressional or State or municipal, that no one, even a foreigner, pagan, or otherwise, should be permitted to erect a pagan temple and set up and worship idols therein. This would be a lawful, civil act, and would not unite Church and State.”*AMS April 1888, page 28.2*

This is a fair specimen of National Reform logic. Let us analyze it. “If all the people of the United States were Christians,” they would have a right to pass a law prohibiting the erection of pagan temples, and the worshiping of idols. Upon this we would note the following three points:*AMS April 1888, page 28.3*

1. If all the people of the United States were Christians, such a law would not be necessary, for Christians do not erect heathen temples, nor do they worship idols. If they were all Christians, we

cannot see why any such laws could be called for, unless the Christians were of the class who believe that they ought to do a certain thing, but haven't enough conscience in the matter to do it without being compelled. We have heard people say, "I believe Sunday ought to be kept, and if there was a law compelling everybody to keep it, I would keep it." Such ones are on a par with those who want a law forbidding Sunday railroad travel, so that they will not be tempted to patronize the railroads on Sunday, or to get up Sunday excursions to camp-meetings.*AMS April 1888, page 28.4*

2. But we will not find very much fault with our friend's statement. Although it would seem like a bit of foolishness for a lot of people who are already Christians to get together and pass a law forbidding any one of them to erect a heathen temple, we would have no objection to their amusing themselves in that way if they wanted to. And right here we will say that if the National Reformers will wait until the people of the United States are all Christians, not in name simply, but in fact, before they press their measures, we will join with them. But even in that case we would not admit that they would have any right to say what should be done by those who might not be Christians, or, to prohibit anybody from giving up his Christianity, and adopting any other form of worship. In the case supposed, the people of the country would form one large church, and might, just as any church now may, pass laws regulating their conduct as church-members; and whenever anyone did not wish to abide by those laws, he would simply lose his church membership, but not his citizenship. Anything intended to affect those not Christians, and not church-members, would be religious legislation, and would unite Church and State. The facts, in short, are these: Any organization has a right to make laws regulating the actions of members of that society, so long as they remain members, and no longer. The Odd Fellows have rules for their order, which must be observed by everyone who wishes to retain his membership in that order. But if the State should pass a law requiring every citizen to observe those rules, then we would say that Odd Fellowship and State were united. So also with the church.*AMS April 1888, page 28.5*

3. "If all the people of the United States were Christians, ...they

would do right in passing a law, ... that no one...should be permitted to erect a pagan temple, and set up and worship idols therein." This statement is a virtual admission that they would not do right in passing such a law, if all were not Christians. And that is exactly the case. Nobody has a right to say what, or how, or when, anybody else shall worship. To say that if all the people of the United States were Christians, they would do right in passing a law that not even a pagan should erect a heathen temple, is simply nonsense; for if there were a single pagan here the people would not all be Christians. But we affirm that if all the people of the United States were Christians, with only one exception, they would not have the slightest right to say what that one should or should not worship.*AMS April 1888, page 29.1*

Here, as before, we wish to emphasize the fact that if all were Christians, they would have a right to pass laws against idolatry, which should affect themselves as Christians, and none others. But they would have no right to say that nobody should come to this country, unless he believed just as they did. Here again is shown the inconsistency of National Reformers. They raise a great hue and cry against the injustice of limiting Chinese immigration, yet they hold to views that would not only exclude the greater portion of foreign immigration, but would expatriate many who are loyal citizens. This is bigotry of the worse kind. It virtually says, "Every thing that we do is right, no matter how wrong it may be in others." We affirm the absolute right of every man to live wherever he pleases on this earth, and to believe what he pleases.*AMS April 1888, page 29.2*

But many who would assent to this, might hesitate to say that the Government has no right to prohibit blasphemy. The third commandment is the touch-stone. If civil governments have a right to enforce the moral law, then they must prohibit blasphemy; if they have the right and power to prohibit blasphemy, then they have the right and the power to legislate on any other matters of morality and religion. In short, the whole matter of the right of the State to legislate on matters of religion, must stand or fall with the right to legislate against blasphemy. We think the following propositions will demonstrate that the State has no right to inflict any penalty, for violation of the third commandment.*AMS April 1888, page 29.3*

If a man has a right, so far as men and human governments are concerned, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, he has an equal right not to worship him at all. That religion is to be a matter of free choice with every individual, is evident from the gospel call, "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." If whosoever will, may come, then whosoever will not, may stay away. Man's free agency is everywhere recognized in the Bible. To be sure, certain penalties are announced as sure to be visited upon those who do not accept the gospel; but these penalties are visited, not for refusal to accept the gospel, but for the sins which they have committed, from which they would have been freed by accepting the gospel, but which, since they do not come to Christ, remain upon them. The truth is, that every man is just as free to reject the gospel as he is to accept it. So far as men are concerned, he has as much right to believe nothing as he has to believe in God and the Bible.*AMS April 1888, page 29.4*

2. If no man has a right to compel another to worship God, then men have no right to compel such an one to show reverence for God; for reverence is worship. The man who reverences God, worships him; and the man who does not reverence and worship God, violates the third commandment, even though he does not openly blaspheme.*AMS April 1888, page 29.5*

1. If it be claimed that refraining from taking God's name in vain is not an act of worship, and does not indicate reverence for him, then the same thing must be true with reference to heathen gods. And then if the heathen were in a majority in this country, or if we were in a heathen country, they would have a right to compel us to refrain from speaking against their gods. For,*AMS April 1888, page 29.6*

2. Blasphemy is not simply the use of profane oaths, but speaking against God. Last year a man was convicted of blasphemy, in New Jersey, yet there was no evidence that he had sworn. The only thing for which he was convicted, was for speaking most disrespectfully of God; the Bible, and religion. When our missionaries go to foreign lands, they blaspheme the gods of the heathen. Paul was at Ephesus, he declared that "they be no gods which are made with hands." Now if the National Reform idea that

the majority ought to rule in matters of religion, be true, then Paul ought not to have said anything against those heathen gods.*AMS April 1888, page 29.7*

1. The ten commandments comprise the sum of all morality. The perfect keeping of them is perfect religion. To conscientiously and truly refrain from taking God's name in vain; that is, to reverence the name of God, is an act of religion. Therefore, if obedience to the third commandment may be enforced by the State, then the State may enforce religion upon all. The germ of all religious legislation lies in the enactment of laws against blasphemy.*AMS April 1888, page 29.8*

But it may be said that our God is the true God, and that the Christian religion is the true religion, and that therefore people ought to worship our God, and adhere to our religion; that the gods of the heathen are no gods at all, and that we alone have a right to enforce laws concerning religion. Then we set ourselves up as the only ones who have the right of choice in matters of religion. And then the question might well be asked by the heathen, Who gave you a right to choose your religion and ours too? Have we not equal rights with you?*AMS April 1888, page 29.9*

Let our National Reform friends turn their whole attention to making men Christians, in accordance with gospel methods. When they have done that, so that this is in fact a Christian Nation, and all the people without exception, are Christians, and of one mind, then it will be time enough to talk about making laws prescribing the forms of religion.*AMS April 1888, page 29.10*

E.J.W.

"Mr. Gault Speaks" American Sentinel 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In the Sentinel of December, 1887, in answer to the Christian Statesman's inquiry, we wrote this-*AMS April 1888, page 29.11*

"The Sentinel espouses the Christian theory of government; the theory enunciated by Christ, that men shall render to Cæsar the

things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's; the theory that so far as man or civil government is concerned, the heathen, or the infidel, or the atheist, has just as much right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, as the Christian has." *AMS April 1888, page 29.12*

With this Mr. I.A. Gault makes his voice to clash after this sort: *AMS April 1888, page 29.13*

"There are two difficulties about the Sentinel's theory of government, one is its readers don't understand it, and the other is it don't understand itself. If it would only reason a moment it might discover that in our Government Cæsar represents the people, and among the things we must render to Cæsar is one day's rest in seven, and the security of the family relation, the security of life, liberty and property." *AMS April 1888, page 29.14*

The great trouble with Mr. Gault is that he measures other people's understanding by his own; and because he doesn't understand a thing, he at once decides that nobody else does. The gentleman greatly mistakes; the readers of the Sentinel do understand it, and the Sentinel thoroughly understands itself. As for Mr. Gault the Sentinel can only repeat to him the answer that Dr. Johnson once gave to one who said that he "didn't understand:" "I give you reasons, sir; I cannot give you an understanding, sir." *AMS April 1888, page 29.15*

Then he informs us that if we should reason a moment we might discover that "among the things we must render to Cæsar is one day's rest in seven." Well, let us reason a moment. Christ commanded: "Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Now how did Cæsar ever come into possession of one day's rest in seven? The truth is he never came into possession of such a thing at all. The word of God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath [rest] of the Lord thy God." The Sabbath is God's. He called it "My holy day" It is "the Lord's day." And the Lord has never resigned to Cæsar the possession of this day. Now as we are to render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar's, and as the Sabbath is wholly the Lord's, therefore there never can be any obligation upon any soul to render to Cæsar any

such thing as the Sabbath or one day's rest in seven. Cæsar has no proprietorship whatever in the Sabbath, and he has no right to any. And whenever he attempts to assert any such thing, he obtrudes himself upon the rights and prerogatives of God; puts himself in the place of God; and demands the obedience which is due to God alone. And that is the principle of all Sabbath laws, and of Sunday laws, enforced by the civil power. And the Sentinel is going to tell the people so.*AMS April 1888, page 30.1*

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In his revival services in Kansas City, last January, "Sam" Jones said one day:-*AMS April 1888, page 29.1*

"One reason why I favor woman suffrage is because we would have more Christian voters if the women were allowed to vote."*AMS April 1888, page 29.2*

True enough, but would we not have more un-Christian voters too? If not, why not? Not all of the women in the United States are Christians, by any means. The truth is, that there are a great many more women in the United States who are not Christians, than there are who are Christians. And although it is true that to give women the ballot, will give more Christian voters, it is equally true that there will be more un-Christian voters also, and in the end the matter would not be helped at all. History does not present women-politicians in any better light then it does men-politicians.*AMS April 1888, page 29.3*

In a sermon at Kansas City, January 22, "Sam" Small, in speaking of our country said:-*AMS April 1888, page 29.4*

"From Maine and Massachusetts, to Georgia, all along the coast, the characters of the settlements gave it as one of their objects to glorify God, and forward his kingdom... Then the heresy of hell took hold of a handful of people, and they made a Constitution, and left God entirely out of it."*AMS April 1888, page 29.5*

We had thought to make some comments on this, but to brand as

“the heresy of hell,” the action of George Washington, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and the other noble makers of the United States Constitution, is sufficient of itself to render infamous the whole complaint which the speaker makes against the Constitution. Mr. Small is an evangelist and a great revivalist; now here is a conundrum: If the religion which he inculcates is compatible with such defamation as the above, then how much better off would this Nation be, if such religion should become National? We give it up.*AMS April 1888, page 29.6*

The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union of Marion County, Missouri, in convention assembled at Palmyra, in that State, “resolved” that,-*AMS April 1888, page 29.7*

“We believe the very same condemnation and punishment should be visited upon man as upon woman for violation of the moral law.”*AMS April 1888, page 29.8*

So do we, and more than that, we know that it will be, for the Author of the moral law has said that “there is no respect of persons with God.” What could have led these excellent Christian women to think that the same condemnation and punishment might *not* be visited upon man as upon woman for violation of the moral law, when the word of God is so plain on the subject?*AMS April 1888, page 29.9*

Do they suppose the Lord is going to prove recreant, and that it is therefore necessary for them to remind him of his duty? We suspect, however, that they have fallen into the dangerous error of believing that it is within the province of civil government to punish violation of the moral law, and they are contemplating the taking of God’s work into their own hands*AMS April 1888, page 29.10*

In the February Sentinel, it will be remembered that we asked Mr. W.T. McConnell “to show any commandment of God for keeping Sunday.” We do not intend for a moment to convey the idea that we would not be opposed to civil laws enforcing its observance, even though it were commanded by the law of God. This was simply an *argumentum ad hominem*. We would be just as much opposed to civil laws enforcing the observance of Sunday, or any other day, even though it were commanded by the law of God, as we are as it is. Our opposition to Sunday laws is from principle and not from

partisanship. The principle is that the civil power has no right to enforce the observance of any religious institution, of any kind whatever; nor to enforce any duty as a commandment of God. Yet, as against this principle, the Sunday institution is doubly weak: First it is wholly an ecclesiastical institution, and secondly, there is no commandment of God for it. And as the National Reformers propose to enforce the keeping of Sunday as a commandment of God, of course it is perfectly in order for us to call for the commandment, while at the same time we would oppose civil laws enforcing it, even though there were a commandment of God for it. *AMS April 1888, page 29.11*

“Not a Christian Nation” American Sentinel 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

It would be difficult to use language in a looser way than by calling this “a Christian Nation.” In all the Nation there is not a single town, nor a village even, in which the people are all Christians. A single family in which all are Christians is seldom found; and individual Christians are not abundant. We do not say these things to find fault; we are simply stating the facts in the case, as every person knows who looks at things as they are. Let any person anywhere in the land honestly ask himself the question, and honestly answer it, How many of my immediate neighbors and acquaintances actually show in the works of a godly life that they are real, consistent Christians? In the face of facts as they are, the answer only can be, Very few. How many are really separate from the world, and conformed to the will of Christ? *AMS April 1888, page 32.1*

Take even the churches themselves, and everybody knows, and the churches themselves confess, that many of their members will not bear the test of the precepts of Christ. Many, of them love the opera or the circus more than they love the prayer-meetings; and the excursion more than the services of the church; and the newspaper more than the sermon; and pleasure more than God; and the world more than Christ. Then, while it is thus with the church, where is the sense of calling the Nation, Christian? and while the church is so nearly half full of worldlings, what is the use of talking about this being a Christian Nation? The trouble is that

they put upon the term “Christian” a construction so loose that there is scarcely any discernible distinction between many of those who bear it and those who don’t, and then spread the term over the whole mass, and thus they have a “Christian” Nation. But so long as the term “Christian” means what the word of God means-so long as it means strict conformity to the precepts of Christ-just so long it will be that this is not, and cannot be, a Christian Nation, except by each individual’s becoming a Christian by an abiding, working faith in Christ.*AMS April 1888, page 32.2*

May 1888

“Front Page” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The military authorities of France have recently issued stringent orders regarding the observance of Sunday, and an officer who called out his men to practice on that day, was sentenced to the penal colony of New Caledonia. This the *Christian Nation* uses as an example which it would be wise for these United States to follow. That is to say that the United States should adopt the principles of the Papacy to the extent that France carries them forth. It will probably be done. *AMS May 1888, page 33.1*

Since the Elgin Sunday-law Convention, the Illinois preachers have been enlarging their field of operations. They have issued four petitions: One to the United States Senate, one to the House of Representatives, one each to the railroad and the telegraph companies in the United States, asking for their co-operation. One of their circulars says:-*AMS May 1888, page 33.2*

“God’s trumpet-call to every minister of the gospel, to every Christian and patriotic man and woman, and the public press in these United States, is that they ‘advance along the line’ against this giant sin of Sabbath [Sunday] desecration, which is sapping the foundations of our republican institutions.”*AMS May 1888, page 33.3*

If there is anything in this world that is sapping the foundations of our republican institutions more than is this movement of the churches to wield the power of the State, then we wish somebody would name it. There ought to be a million copies of the March Sentinel distributed at once in Illinois, and ten millions throughout the country besides; it shows what these Illinois preachers are up to, and what will come of it.*AMS May 1888, page 33.4*

“The California Church and State Convention” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The California State Prohibition Convention was held in San Francisco the first week in April. The first words of its platform were these:-*AMS May 1888, page 33.5*

“The Prohibition party of the State of California in convention assembled, reverently recognize Almighty God as the supreme ruler, to whose laws all human laws should conform.”*AMS May 1888, page 33.6*

The seventh plank in its platform is this:-*AMS May 1888, page 33.7*

“We declare that Sunday is an institution so interwoven into our laws, our customs, our civilization, and the very structure of our Government, so intricately and beneficently connected with our social, business, and moral life, that we cannot dispense with it without sacrificing the very best interests of the country and the highest welfare of the whole people. And so believing, we demand the enactment and enforcement of an intelligent and rational Sunday law.”*AMS May 1888, page 33.8*

The discussion of these two parts of the platform is of interest to those who are watching the growth of religion as a power in politics. We quote from the published report:-*AMS May 1888, page 33.9*

“The first section being read, about twenty delegates jumped to their feet for recognition. One clerical gentleman, with long gray hair, and wearing glasses, made a long address in which he mixed up religion and politics, declaring that the party ought to recognize the Young Men’s Christian Association and the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, and that pre-eminently the convention ought to adopt the reverential section addressed to the Almighty.”*AMS May 1888, page 33.10*

“Mr. Robinson, of Sonoma County, wanted to stop and calmly consider the fact that the gentlemen of the Republican party did not lug religion into their platform. It was unwise to do anything to bring about a conflict of religious opinion. He believed that God Almighty cared little for compliments to him passed by a Prohibition convention. The speaker objected to bringing in the Church and State.”*AMS May 1888, page 33.11*

“Before he could proceed further the speaker was greeted by shouts of, ‘No, no!’ yells and hisses.*AMS May 1888, page 33.12*

“The chairman shouted, ‘Time, time!’ and hit the desk vigorously with his gavel.*AMS May 1888, page 33.13*

“Mr. Robinson, having by this time caught his second wind, made a motion to strike out the section recognizing God in the platform.*AMS May 1888, page 33.14*

“Another howl of indignation arose from the opposition, who were greatly in the majority, while amendments and amendments to those again were offered, and the matter became so twisted up that the convention hardly knew where it stood. The original question being finally put, the entire first section, with the objectionable recognition of the Deity, was carried, there being only two or three opposing votes.”*AMS May 1888, page 33.15*

“When the seventh section was read Dr. Yarnell, of Los Angeles, moved to amend by striking out the word ‘Sunday’ and substituting ‘Sabbath.’*AMS May 1888, page 33.16*

“Mr. Robinson, of Sonoma, who seemed to have as clear an idea of business and dispatch as any member of the convention, again bobbed up and said that the motion was only recurring on the question of Church and State. He moved to strike out everything relating to Sunday.*AMS May 1888, page 33.17*

“Dr. Calhoun, of San Jose, threw himself into the breach and declared that Sunday was not an institution, while the Sabbath was. By using that term you used none that was objectionable to anyone. The reverend gentleman then went back 1,800 years and began an argument on religion in general.*AMS May 1888, page 33.18*

“Miller, of Los Angeles, moved to lay the amendments on the table. After argument had been going on for ten minutes the chair ruled the question was not debatable.*AMS May 1888, page 33.19*

“Judge Bourne, of San Bernardino, cut the Gordian knot by offering an amendment that nothing in the platform interfere with the religious observance of Sabbath by Christians if so disposed.*AMS*

May 1888, page 33.20

“One member objected to the motion because it would cut off Hebrews.*AMS May 1888, page 33.21*

“Henry French, of San Jose, declared that he wanted to put himself on record right here, and say that he would not live in a country where there was no Sunday; he’d rather go to the Fiji Islands first. Shut up the saloons from Saturday night until Monday morning and they would soon be compelled to close up entirely.*AMS May 1888, page 33.22*

“Judge Elliot, of Stockton, said that if the party went into the campaign with the Sunday plank in the platform, they would have to pass half the time in convincing the people that it was not a religious movement.*AMS May 1888, page 33.23*

“After half an hour of debate, Judge Bourne’s amendment was lost by a vote of 73 to 84.*AMS May 1888, page 33.24*

“The original resolution as presented in the platform originally was adopted.”*AMS May 1888, page 33.25*

This we insert not so much for comment at this time, as for the purpose of setting before our readers a view of the rising of the evil tide which the Sentinel has been pointing out now for nearly three years. When opposition to Church and State is met in a Prohibition or any other sort of a convention with, “No, no, yells and hisses,” then such convention ought to be condemned by every man who has any regard for civil and religious liberty, for human right, or for purity in either politics or religion. This is more than “a straw” showing which way the religio-political wind is blowing. The Church and State party is now the proper name for the Prohibition party of California.*AMS May 1888, page 33.26*

“An Alarm Needed” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

In the March Sentinel we made an extended quotation from the Christian Union, of which the following is the most important

portion:*AMS May 1888, page 37.1*

“It is not impossible that the time may come when the old antagonism of the Catholic and the Protestant may appear insignificant in view of the deeper antagonisms which shall make them essentially one... It is quite possible that the time may come when the real issue will be between the theist and atheist; the man who believe in God, and order, and freedom, and rights of person and property, on the one side, and the man who disbelieves in all these, on the other side. Whenever that time comes the Protestant and the Catholic will stand side by side in a common defense of those common beliefs which have been their mutual possessions these many centuries. Stranger things have happened in history than such a change of attitude as would be involved in the fellowship of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant.”*AMS May 1888, page 37.2*

This quotation is only one of many similar utterances, and as we showed in that number of the Sentinel is nothing but the preparation for Church and State union, because that is the one distinctive feature of the Roman Catholic Church.*AMS May 1888, page 37.3*

But the Christian Union does not profess to follow denominational lines very closely, and therefore it may be thought that its utterance does not in any degree represent the drift of modern Protestantism. Accordingly we present another statement very similar to the above. The Rev. Dr. Henry M. Field, editor of the New York Evangelist (Presbyterian) said in a recent issue of his paper:-*AMS May 1888, page 37.4*

“The late President Hitchcock often said to us, when we discussed the dangers to society from socialists and communists, that we might yet come to look upon the Roman Catholic Church as the most conservative power in the country, if, by its influence over the Irish, it should keep them from running into the excesses by which so many of the French and Germans were carried away. It is conservative also in preserving the name of Christendom against the great flood of infidelity which is sweeping over the land. Here is a tremendous power exercised by the Roman Catholic Church over millions of our countrymen, and it is the height of folly and

fanaticism to alienate it from us by standing always in an attitude of antagonism.”*AMS May 1888, page 37.5*

And an Episcopalian clergyman of Central New York wrote as follows to Dr. Field:-*AMS May 1888, page 38.1*

“I do want to thank you for what you say about the treatment of Roman Catholics. How vastly better than infidelity is that church, and what a check it is to the same! Surely God is in it.”*AMS May 1888, page 38.2*

Such an expression from a representative of the Episcopal Church ought not to occasion any surprise, for there are many prominent members of that denomination who are desirous that it should be known as the American Catholic Church; but when so prominent a Presbyterian as Dr. Field comes out in favor of an alliance with Roman Catholicism, it is very significant. And what Dr. Field says is but an echo of the opinions held by Dr. Hitchcock, of the Union Theological Seminary, and Drs. Hodge and Patton, of Princeton College, both strongholds of Presbyterianism.*AMS May 1888, page 38.3*

From a report in the Congregationalist of April 5, we take the following, which is perhaps even more significant than the statements above quoted; it appeared in that paper under the heading, “Observance of Holy Week.”-*AMS May 1888, page 38.4*

“Probably more Congregational Churches than ever before, marked the eventful days of last week, either at their regular services, or with special meetings.”*AMS May 1888, page 38.5*

“In Lowell, the John Street Church was open every afternoon, and Rev. H.T. Rose gave a brief address, many coming from other churches to listen, and to share in the worship. The churches of Salem united on Good Friday in a communion service at the Crombie Street Church, Rev. L.B. Voorhees preaching”*AMS May 1888, page 38.6*

“A remarkable series of discourses was given in Worcester at the union meetings of the Central Church and St. John Episcopal, each house of worship being alternately used. The preachers we were

Drs. Merriman, Tucker, Herrick, and Phillips Brooks. These union meetings continuing through Lent, have fostered the spirit of unity, and desire for aggressive work.*AMS May 1888, page 38.7*

"As last year, union services were held in Pittsfield every noon, for half an hour, in the First Church, only one clergyman being in the pulpit, and the exercises consisting of prayer, hymns, a scripture reading covering the incidents of the day, and a few fitting words. The congregation united in the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer. On Good Friday the service, 'The Watch on the Cross,' was held at St. Stephen's Church from twelve till three o'clock, being conducted by Rector W.W. Newton. Each of the other evangelical clergymen of the town spoke briefly on one of the seven words of the cross. The services have had a meditative and strength-giving character, and the yearly observance of the week is now a settled thing.*AMS May 1888, page 38.8*

"The observance was more general than ever in Hartford. The Asylum Hill and South Churches each held daily services at 5 p.m. The Center, Park, and Pearl Street churches held union services for five evenings. At the Fourth Church the annual week-night communion service was held. Dr. Stainer's 'Passion Music' was rendered at the Good Friday service in the South Church."*AMS May 1888, page 38.9*

These things show a strong and increasing tendency among the professed Protestants to obliterate all seeming differences between them and the Catholic Church, so that there may be complete "Christian union." Perhaps some may not have thought of the fact, but it is a fact, that this is off from the same piece as National Reform. We have often stated, and wish to emphasize the statement, that the American Sentinel is not simply opposing what is known as the National Reform Association, but is uncompromisingly opposed to everything tending toward a union of Church and State, or to a curtailment of civil or religious freedom. We do not believe that the National Reform Association alone could in a hundred years so influence public sentiment as to secure the ends which it seeks; but that Association is only one of the many agencies at work to destroy all that is distinctive about Protestantism. The regular National Reformers have already

committed themselves to union with Roman Catholics, by stating that in a world's Christian convention many countries could be represented only by Catholics, and that they would have no objection to having the Catholic Bible and Catholic instruction in the public schools where Catholics are in the majority. The Prohibition party in many States is fully committed to laws enforcing religion; the Women's Christian Temperance Union has indorsed the work of the National Reform Association; the Catholic Church exists in the foundation of Church and State; and the Protestant churches are courting the Catholic Church. Surely there is need enough for an alarm to be sounded.*AMS May 1888, page 38.10*

E.J.W.

"Sunday-Law Fallacies Exposed" American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette* of March 10 makes some good points against the advocates of civil statutes to enforce the observance of Sunday, or, as they call it, Sabbath. The article is too long to print entire, but we insert the main points, that expose the sophistry of those political religionists who propose to enforce religious observances under cover of civil statutes; and who propose to carry civil government into the realm of morals, or rather propose to reduce the moral law to a level with civil statutes, and to give to the law of God the sanction of civil enactments.*AMS May 1888, page 39.1*

"Separated from the Creator's seventh day of rest, the Sabbath commandment would be separated from its foundation and meaning. Has Jehovah repealed the seventh-day commandment? If so, let the repealing word be shown. Can man repeal it? Can man shift Jehovah's law from the seventh to the first day? Can he say that the story of the six days' work of creation is a myth of an ignorant people, and that God did no corporal work, and was not tired, and that creation may have been evolution through millions of years, and that the essence of the commandment is that one day in seven, or one-seventh of the time, shall be a day of cessation from the ordinary vocations?*AMS May 1888, page 39.2*

“A letter in the Commercial Gazette of the 6th, laying down the standards of the Presbyterian Church, and warning this paper against ‘leaving the sphere of the secular and entering the arena of the religious,’ shows that that church has repealed the seventh-day commandment, and has re-enacted it for the first day, whereby it has created the sin of Sabbath-breaking on the first day. No prudent person can wish to enter the ‘religious arena’ to deny that the Presbyterian Church can repeal the law of God, and can enact a law to create new sins. But such repeal and enactment are binding only on Presbyterians, and cannot be made the ground of State statutes. As to the ‘religious arena,’ the newspaper province extends over all that concerns mankind. It recognizes no taboo.*AMS May 1888, page 39.3*

“The consciousness that the separation of the commandment from its foundation in the Creator’s rest day, abandons all foundation for a day of holy time, and all foundation for a moral or civil code which makes sins of things on one day which are not sins on other days, is that which makes good people cling to a part of the commandment, and try to enforce it on Sunday, after they have abolished it as to the Sabbath day. In this they fly from the commandment to the argument of man’s welfare-which cuts loose from the commandment-and then they fly from the argument of man’s liberty in his welfare, to the commandment of holy time which they have repealed.*AMS May 1888, page 39.4*

“The matter of inhibition from work, for the relief of the toilers, is one thing. The Sabbath commandment of Jehovah’s holy day is another thing. The argument of man’s welfare makes man free to adapt the inhibition to his welfare. But man may not adapt Jehovah’s seventh-day Sabbath law to his idea of his own welfare. If that commandment stands, it is for the day it commands. It is a law or it is not. It is no fast-and-loose law...*AMS May 1888, page 39.5*

“They declare Sunday the moral ruin of the people. They prove it by alleged statistics of criminal prosecutions to show that more crimes of violence are committed on Sunday than on all other days of the week. Why is this? Because the saloons are open? They are open on other days. This reduces them to the sole reason that it is because it is a day of idleness.*AMS May 1888, page 39.6*

“Their argument is absolutely destructive to the beneficence of the custom of a rest day. They continually affirm that a Sabbath day is the very foundation of religion, morals, and society, and they as incessantly declare that the custom of Sunday cessation from work in the cities has made it a day of moral ruin. What is their recourse from the destruction which they charge upon the day of idleness? To make statutes more stringent to enforce idleness. Arguing that idleness on that day leads mankind to moral ruin, they call for a more rigid enforcement of idleness, to lead mankind to the ways of salvation.*AMS May 1888, page 39.7*

“Surely there is need to revise their basis in season before they can proceed rationally in legislation. Selling beer is no more a sin on Sun-day than on other days. The reason why more crimes of violence are done on Sunday than on other days-if that is a fact-is not that the saloons are open, but that men are idle. The good of a day of rest for the toilers has to be taken with the drawback of this unavoidable evil from idleness and indulgence of the appetites. The cause is the cessation of vocations. The attempt to close the saloons is a diversion from the true cause, and is a vain attempt to deal with one of the effects.*AMS May 1888, page 39.8*

“Moral laws must have a foundation of truth, or they will make no headway. The attempt to found Sunday laws or Sunday observance on the Sabbath commandment is to give them a false bottom. The affirmation of the Sabbath law as binding on the conscience on Sunday, as a reason for Sunday statutes, while disclaiming any desire to enforce religious observance by statute, is crooked. The pretense that the saloons are the cause of the crimes of the day of idleness, is not true. Still, there is an eternal power in truth, which will bring to naught all statutes and moral causes which reject truth from the foundation, and try to build upon false assumptions.”*AMS May 1888, page 39.9*

“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

It is reported in the religious press that a great revival is progressing in Tokio, Japan, with no fewer than five hundred conversions in a

single month. One religious journal, in noting the wonderful revival, and how recently the country was wholly pagan, says: "Everybody is interested in Christianity, and nobody speaks against it." Well, then, we fear that Christianity is in a bad condition in Japan. Christ said: "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets." When the Christians were only "a sect" that was everywhere spoken against, Christianity was pure and undefiled; but when Constantine elevated Christianity to the throne of the world, and nobody spoke against it, but men found that they gained popularity by accepting it, then real Christianity fled, and "that wicked" took its place. We do not believe Christ's words have any less application to-day than they had eighteen hundred years ago.*AMS May 1888, page 40.1*

Not long ago the religious journals of New York were very active in working for the Saturday half-holiday. Now the bank superintendent of the State, in his report to the Legislature, has recommended that the law be so amended as to be limited in its operations to July and August, during which months business in the cities is usually suspended on Saturday afternoons; and the Independent says that "a better recommendation would have been a total repeal of the law altogether." It truthfully adds:-*AMS May 1888, page 40.2*

"The truth is, that the law is really of no service to anybody. The design of the Legislature in passing it was simply to humbug the working people, by seeming to do something for them, when in fact doing nothing except to their injury."*AMS May 1888, page 40.3*

And that is just the case with all Sunday legislation. If the workingmen allow the Sunday-law advocates to humbug them into thinking that the object of Sunday laws is to benefit them, they will find out the contrary to their sorrow when it is too late to remedy the matter.*AMS May 1888, page 40.4*

In a recent address before the Young Women's Christian Temperance Union in Oakland, Rev. Dr. Horton stated that he had been credibly in-formed that during this Lenten season there were many families which gave their children wine in the place of meat, and said that teachers in certain schools complained that those children became utterly unmanageable in consequence. Was there

ever a worse exhibition of straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel? We believe Lent is a period of time devoted to the mortification of the flesh! "The church" forbids the use of meat during that time, so that the body may be kept under; and these people, who would think it almost a mortal sin to disobey the church in this regard, give their children (and undoubtedly themselves also) wine, which is ten times worse than meat could be. This is a fair sample of the working of a religion that is fixed by law; formalism at the expense of piety must always be the result.*AMS May 1888, page 40.5*

We have received from the editor of the *Herold der Wahrheit* a translation of a part of the remarks of the prosecuting attorney of the city of Cassel, Germany, in the case of the Rev. Thummel, who was indicted for attacking the Papacy and calling the Pope antichrist. In moving for nine months' imprisonment for Thummel, and two months' imprisonment for the publisher of the article, the prosecuting attorney said, among other things:-*AMS May 1888, page 40.6*

"The defendant refers (or appeals) to Dr. M. Luther. First, it must be considered that Luther lived three hundred years ago, and that meanwhile the customs, the tone, and tastes, etc., have changed. If Luther lived today, and should say and write the same things that he did then, he would undoubtedly, by reason of section 166 of the Penal Code, be condemned."*AMS May 1888, page 40.7*

Undoubtedly; and this is in a city where the majority of the churches today are Lutheran. If a man should be condemned now for using language similar to that which Luther used three hundred years ago, then he ought to have been condemned then, for it is Rome's boast that she never changes. If Luther were alive today he would undoubtedly say the same things about the Catholic Church that he said in the days of Leo X., and would include many professed Protestants in his remarks. Fortunately there are some still who are animated by the same spirit that Luther was, and who do not flatter the Pope simply because his power is increasing.*AMS May 1888, page 40.8*

"A Deserved Rebuke" American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

In the latter part of March, the Methodist Episcopal Conference of Kansas adopted resolutions refusing to support any political party that will not agree to play into their hands. The *Interior* (Presbyterian) administers a just and deserved rebuke, which we here insert, not only for the good in the matter itself, but also as another evidence of the rapid growth of Church and State ideas. We ask, for the weighty words of the *Interior*, the careful consideration that is their due.*AMS May 1888, page 40.9*

“The Methodist conference for Kansas, at its meeting in Topeka last week, passed resolutions demanding national prohibition and refusing to support any political party which does not stand squarely upon their platform. They demanded: 1. That the United States shall not issue permits to sell liquor in any State unless the same be countersigned by the State authorities. 2. Prohibition in the District of Columbia, the Territories, etc. 3. The importation of liquors into any State to be by the consent of the State. 4. A prohibitory amendment to the Constitution of the United States.*AMS May 1888, page 40.10*

“Just what the practical effect of these provisions might be, it is not safe to undertake in advance to determine. But the purpose of these brethren was to put down the liquor traffic, and therefore it was a righteous purpose. But we would not like to have our presbytery or assembly pledge our church to the defeat of any political party not committed to these particular measures. We would not like to have our church committed to a war of extermination upon the Republican party or the Democratic party. As the clause in our Confession forbidding the church to meddle with civil affairs is now under scrutiny, the action of the Methodist conference affords a very good illustration.*AMS May 1888, page 40.11*

“Let us suppose, now, that the Methodist Episcopal Church, which at the North, we may say, is pretty nearly solidly Republican, should receive and obey a mandate from its general conference to vote against the Republican party—that would defeat that party. There are over 100,000 offices and over a thousand millions of treasure

dependent upon that stake. Can a church have the awarding of such political spoils to one or another political party and remain morally pure? No reasonable man will believe it. Nothing has yet been seen in history in the way of ecclesiastical corruption that would compare with the horrible mixture of cant and rascality that would follow. This shows that, however attractive from a moral standpoint ecclesiastico-political action may be, it is in the highest degree perilous. In forbidding it our Confession of Faith deals with principles of religion and morality that are unchangeable and decisive.”*AMS May 1888, page 40.12*

It is stated that Colorado has great hopes of becoming the tobacco-producing district of this country, careful experiments having determined that many varieties of tobacco will yield enormous crops upon its soil. The *Oakland Times* says:—*AMS May 1888, page 40.13*

“If Colorado cannot produce the requisite soil and climate, it could certainly be found in California. With our vast domain it is ridiculous that we should still be spending eight to ten millions of dollars per year in buying the weed from Cuba and Sumatra.”*AMS May 1888, page 40.14*

We should say that if Californians must use eight to ten million dollars’ worth of tobacco every year, it will be vastly cheaper to import it than to ruin good land in producing it. It is well known that there is nothing that grows that exhausts the soil so much as tobacco. Much good land in Connecticut and Virginia has been rendered unfit for use, because it has been devoted to tobacco-raising. Tobacco has only one mission, and that is, to kill, and it does that effectually, whether applied to the land, to men, or to pestiferous vermin.”*AMS May 1888, page 40.15*

June 1888

“Catholic Schools” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

Two men in West Chester, Pa., William S. Bowen and Philip Maguire, members of the Catholic Church, withdrew their children from the parochial school, and sent them to the public school. On Sunday, April 27, they were publicly excommunicated by the priest, he “announcing from the altar that William S. Bowen, Assistant Manager of the West Chester Gas Company, and Philip Maguire, one of the editors of the Daily News, would hereafter be forbidden a seat in the church, and that they would be refused the sacraments, living or dead.”*AMS June 1888, page 43.1*

The priest gave his reasons for this, as follows:-*AMS June 1888, page 43.2*

“These gentlemen were excommunicated on my own authority and the authority of the arch-bishop, with whom I had consulted in the matter. I took their pews from them because I do not propose that anyone shall hold a pew in this church who is in open rebellion against its laws, when there are faithful and obedient members who are willing to occupy them. Mr. Bowen had the audacity to apply for communion on last Easter morning, and was publicly refused. I had consulted with the archbishop months before in reference to this matter, and it was on the strength of this, and of a letter from his grace, that the refusal was made.”*AMS June 1888, page 43.3*

Mr. Maguire gave his reasons for taking his child from the Catholic school, and sending him to the public school, as follows:-*AMS June 1888, page 43.4*

“The reverend gentleman saw fit to use my name in connection with my refusal to send my child to the parochial school, and also notified those of his congregation present that I was formally excommunicated for this refusal, but he wisely took good care not to state the reason for my refusal to have the boy longer educated at the parish school. I took the boy away because, in my judgment,

the school was far inferior to the public schools of West Chester, and because the penalty for missing a lesson in catechism was a severe whipping. When I inquired, through a letter, about the severity of the lesson and the punishment inflicted, I received, in reply, a letter from his reverence telling me to mind my own business, and that he would not tolerate interference from me. I replied in a letter, which was answered with a notice that my boy was turned out of the Sunday-school because I would not send him to the parish school, and, later on, the priest met me on the street, and in the most overbearing way threatened that he would deny the child the sacraments of the church. Nine-tenths of the parents sending their children to the parish school do so rather from a sense of fear than an understanding that it is good for them to do so. Many of them have told me of their troubles, and of the bad discipline in the school, and of the poor progress that their children make. There is a great deal of smothered dissatisfaction here, and Rev. Samuel B. Spaulding knows it, deny it as he will.”*AMS June 1888, page 43.5*

This is a fair specimen of the foul dealing of the Roman Catholic Church in the matter of schools and schooling. And this is the sort of instruction which the National Reform Association proposes to establish in the public schools wherever the Roman Catholics are in the majority. This is the church to which the National Reform Association proposes to give the control of the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority. We seriously think that if there is in this world an organization more iniquitous than the Roman Catholic Church, it must be the National Reform Association.*AMS June 1888, page 43.6*

“An Alarming Proposition” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

And still they travel the road to Rome. We have frequently of late given in these columns instances of the way in which Catholicism is absorbing Protestantism, or, rather, the way in which Protestantism is plunging headlong into Catholicism, and now we have another step to record. In the Christian at Work of April 12, Prof. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York, had an

article which was continued in the Christian at Work of April 19. The article was entitled, "Is Rome an Ally, an Enemy, or Both?" Starting out with the assertion that "the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant churches are agreed in nine-tenths or more of the contents of Christianity," Doctor Briggs makes some statements concerning the Reformation, and then says:-*AMS June 1888, page 43.7*

"We are agreed as to the essentials of Christianity. Our common faith is based on the so-called Apostles' Creed, and worship on the Lord's prayer, our morals upon the ten commandments and the sermon on the mount. Who will venture to say that the Roman Catholic Church is not as faithful to these foundations of our common religion as Protestants? Taking our stand on the apostles' creed, we must add to the articles of faith on which we are agreed, all the doctrinal achievements of the church for fifteen centuries, the doctrine of the unity of God, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the holy Trinity, original sin and human depravity, salvation by divine grace, the absolute need of the atonement of Jesus Christ. On all these great doctrines of our religion Romanism and Protestantism are one. Here we are allies, and it is our common task to proclaim these doctrines to the heathen world, and to overcome by them all forms of irreligion and infidelity in Christian lands. And differences about justification by faith, and salvation by the divine grace alone, and the authority of the church as regards the determination of the canon of Scripture, and its interpretation, ought not to prevent our co-operation and alliance in the great work of indicating and proclaiming the common faith. Our conflict over the doctrines in which we differ would be more fruitful in good results if our contest should be based upon concord and alliance in the common faith. If our contest could be narrowed to the real points of difference, and that contest could be conducted in a brave, chivalrous, and loving manner, the results would be more fruitful.*AMS June 1888, page 43.8*

"Taking our stand upon the Lord's prayer, we observe that as to the greater part of Christian worship we are agreed. We worship God in common, in morning and evening assemblies, by prayer, songs of praise, the reading and preaching of the Scriptures, and the celebration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper. All

this is common. Furthermore, we take the liberty of affirming that the matter of all this worship is for the most part common in both these great bodies of Christians. I have heard sermons in Roman Catholic Churches of Europe which were more evangelical and less objectionable than many sermons I have heard in leading Protestant Churches in Berlin, London, and New York. It is well known that the Protestant books of liturgy contain a considerable amount of material derived from the old mass books, and they are all the more valuable for that. Roman Catholic baptism has many superstitions connected with it, but the essentials of baptism are there in the baptism by the minister in the name of the holy Trinity. Roman Catholic observance of the Lord's Supper is connected with the worship of the materials of the supper under the doctrine that they are really the body and blood of the divine Lord, but who can deny that pious souls by faith really partake of the body and blood of Christ in this holy sacrament, notwithstanding the errors in which it is enveloped? If we look with eyes of Christian charity upon the Lutheran and Zwinglian views, which are regarded as serious errors by the standards of the reformed churches, and would not deny to the participants real communion with Christ, why should we deny such communion to pious Roman Catholics?*AMS June 1888, page 43.9*

"In all matters of worship we are in essential concord with Roman Catholics, and we ought not to hesitate to make an alliance with them so far as possible to maintain the sanctity of the Sabbath as a day of worship, and to proclaim to the world the necessity of worshipping God in his house, and of becoming members of his church by baptism, and of seeking union and communion with the Saviour by Christian worship, the study of the Scripture, and the observance of the Lord's Supper. With this recognition of concord, Protestants can then debate with Romanists in a friendly manner, and seek to overcome their errors, remove the excrescences they have heaped upon the simple worship in the spirit and in truth which seems to us more in accordance with the Scripture and the wishes of our Saviour.*AMS June 1888, page 43.10*

"We should also note that in the great constituent parts of prayer,- invocation, adoration, thanksgiving, confession of sin, petition, intercession, and consecration, Roman Catholic and Protestant worship

are agreed, and consequently the matter of prayer is essentially the same, the differences are less than most people imagine. In Christian song the differences are still less. If our hymn-books were stripped of hymns from the ancient and medieval church, and from modern Roman Catholics, they would be bare indeed. Looking now at the sphere of morals we take our common stand on the ten commandments and the sermon on the mount. As to the vast majority of all questions of morals, Romanism and Protestantism are agreed. It is true there is a great deal of immorality in the Roman Catholic Church in some countries, and we think it may be shown that as a rule Protestantism is productive of better morals than Romanism; but this, after all, is a question of more or less, and to say the least, Protestantism has little to boast of. On all these questions it is of the highest importance that the Roman Catholic Church and Protestant churches should make an alliance. Their joint efforts would have an influence upon public and private morals such as the world has not yet witnessed. We may agree to differ and debate on all questions of morals where there is discord. But when we are agreed on the vast majority of questions that come before the public it is sheer folly for us to waste our energies in antagonism when co-operation and alliance would be productive of vast good.*AMS June 1888, page 43.11*

“We hold, therefore, that the Roman Catholics and the Protestants ought not to hesitate to ally themselves for the maintenance and the preparation of those great principles of Christian doctrine, Christian worship, and Christian morals that they hold in common.”*AMS June 1888, page 44.1*

We think that no apology is needed for this long quotation. The proposed alliance with Rome, the necessity for which Doctor Briggs reiterates so often, is a noteworthy sign of the times, and we could not ignore it and be true to our name. The Doctor seems to base his plea for an alliance quite largely upon the fact that Protestantism is about as bad as Catholicism. He says above that Protestantism has little to boast of over Roman Catholicism, in the way of morality, and elsewhere in the same article he says:-*AMS June 1888, page 44.2*

“Why should we complain of the persecutions that our ancestors suffered from Rome, when we have to lament that others of our

ancestors were merciless to Roman Catholics? Roman Catholic intolerance and bigotry may be matched by Protestant intolerance and bigotry. I doubt whether God looks with any more favor upon these detestable vices in the one than in the other.”*AMS June 1888, page 44.3*

Now all that we can say about this is, “Pity ‘tis, ‘tis true.” It is, no doubt, a valid reason why Protestantism and Roman Catholicism should join, for when Protestantism becomes as bad as Catholicism, we can see no necessity for maintaining a separate existence. For ourselves we think that there is yet quite a difference between the two bodies; but when a prominent professor in one of the leading theological seminaries in the land can see no difference between the Lord’s Supper as celebrated according to the divine command, and the Roman Catholic mass, and when he indorses “all the doctrinal work of the [Catholic] Church for fifteen centuries,” the point of perfect union cannot be far off.*AMS June 1888, page 44.4*

What an array of names we now have in favor of Protestant union with Catholicism,—Doctors Hodge, Hitchcock, Schaff, Patton, Briggs, Field, etc. But who has heard or read of a Catholic priest clamoring for Catholic union with Protestantism? Nobody. Why not? Would not the Catholic Church be willing to enter into such an alliance as these Protestant Doctors of Divinity propose? Most certainly it would be, but the movement must all be made by the Protestants. The Catholic Church will gladly receive the Protestant churches to her bosom,—she will accept their aid in the furtherance of her peculiar schemes,—but she can afford to wait till they come of their own accord, for if they make the proposals, she can dictate the terms.*AMS June 1888, page 44.5*

One more thought. What must we conclude will be the effect of an alliance between Protestantism and Catholicism, when we remember that one of the strongest pleas for such an alliance is—not that Catholicism is as good as Protestantism—but, that Protestantism is nearly, if not quite, as bad as Catholicism? Those who know anything of Rome’s peculiarities, do not need to have an answer given them.*AMS June 1888, page 44.6*

Some may say that we are alarmists. Indeed we are; and we think that anyone who sees such danger approaching and does not sound an alarm, deserves to suffer all the ill that may follow. Our only wish is that we might sound the alarm so loud that it would awaken the thousands who seem to be asleep, and who are in danger of being taken in the snare.*AMS June 1888, page 44.7*

E.J.W.

“Congress and Sunday Legislation” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

We have before referred to the petitions to Congress which were being circulated by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, asking the National Legislature to pass laws stopping Sunday trains, Sunday mails, and Sunday parades in the army and navy. The following from the Union Signal, of May 3, is the latest information that we have on this subject:-*AMS June 1888, page 44.8*

“The Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, gave a hearing to the friends of the Sabbath, on April 6, from ten to twelve. Mrs. J.C. Bateham, our national superintendent of this department, presented the opening paper-a statement of the legislation asked for by the million and more petitioners, with the reasons thereof, basing these on humanitarian grounds, in behalf of the half million laborers deprived of Sabbath rest directly or indirectly by Government work, and because the observance of a rest-day is for the best good of the Government, the people, and our free institutions. Rev. W.F. Crafts then gave a forcible and exhaustive argument for the Sabbath, which will soon appear in Our Day. Able addresses followed: by Dr. T. A. Fernley, secretary of the Philadelphia Sabbath Association; Rev. M.P. Nice, secretary of the Maryland Sabbath Association; Rev. Yates Hickey, secretary of the International Sabbath Association, and Rev. Dr. Elliott, author of “The Abiding Sabbath.” The attendance was large, and the attention most courteous. Senator Blair will now draft and present a bill for us.”*AMS June 1888, page 44.9*

This same question was, in the same way, brought before the United States Senate in 1828-29, and the Senate Committee to whom the subject was referred, made a report, which we herewith reproduce entire. It is of double importance just now, first, because of the soundness of the principles which it enunciates, and secondly, as a standard by which to try the position of the United States Senate as now composed. The report will amply repay careful study. We have italicized certain portions, not only as worthy of special note, but also to render them easier for future reference; because we shall yet have abundant occasion to refer to the report. It is as follows:-*AMS June 1888, page 44.10*

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT - TRANSPORTATION OF THE MAIL ON THE SABBATH.

“The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the following report and resolution, presented by Mr. Johnson, with which the Senate concurred:-*AMS June 1888, page 44.11*

“The committee to whom were referred the several petitions, on the subject of mails on the Sabbath, or first day of the week, report,-*AMS June 1888, page 44.12*

“That some respite is required from the ordinary vocations of life is an established principle, sanctioned by the usages of all nations, whether Christian or pagan. One day in seven has also been determined upon as the proportion of time; and inconformity with the wishes of a great majority of the citizens of this country, the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, has been set apart to that object. The principle has received the sanction of the National Legislature, so far as to admit a suspension of all public business on that day, except in cases of absolute necessity, or of great public utility. This principle the committee would not wish to disturb. If kept within its legitimate sphere of action, no injury can result from its observance. It should, however, be kept in mind that *the proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy.**AMS June 1888, page 44.13*

“We are aware that a variety of sentiment exists among the good

citizens of this Nation, on the subject of the Sabbath day; and our Government is designed for the protection of one as much as another. The Jews, who in this country are as free as Christians, and entitled to the same protection from the laws, derive their obligation to keep the Sabbath day from the fourth commandment of their decalogue, and in conformity with that injunction pay religious homage to the seventh day of the week, which we call Saturday. One denomination of Christians among us, justly celebrated for their piety, and certainly as good citizens as any other class, agree with the Jews in the moral obligation of the Sabbath, and observe the same day. There are, also, many Christians among us who derive not their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the decalogue, but regard the Jewish Sabbath as abrogated. From the example of the apostles of Christ, they have chosen the first day of the week instead of that day set apart in the decalogue, for their religious devotions. These have generally regarded the observance of the day as a devotional exercise, and would not more readily, enforce it upon others than they would enforce secret prayer or devout meditations.*AMS June 1888, page 44.14*

“Urging the fact that neither their Lord nor his disciples, though often censured by their accusers for a violation of the Sabbath, ever en-joined its observance, they regard it as a subject on which every person should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and not coerce others to act upon his persuasion. Many Christians, again, differ from these, professing to derive their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the fourth commandment of the Jewish decalogue, and bring the example of the apostles, who appear to have held their public meetings for worship on the first day of the week, as authority for so far changing the decalogue as to substitute that day for the seventh. The Jewish Government was a theocracy, which enforced religious observances; and though the committee would hope that no portion of the citizens of our country would willingly introduce a system of religious coercion in our civil institutions, the example of other nations should admonish us to watch carefully against its earliest indication. With these different religious views, the committee are of opinion that Congress cannot interfere. *It is not the legitimate province of the Legislature to determine what religion is true, or what false.* *AMS June 1888, page 44.15*

*“Our Government is a civil, and not a religious institution. Our Constitution recognizes in every person the right to choose his own religion, and to enjoy it freely, without molestation. Whatever may be the religious sentiments of citizens, and however variant, they are alike entitled to protection from the Government, so long as they do not invade the rights of others. The transportation of the mail on the first day of the week, it is believed, does not interfere with the rights of conscience. The petitioners for its discontinuance appear to be actuated by a religious zeal, which may be commendable if confined to its proper sphere; but they assume a position better suited to an ecclesiastical than to a civil institution. They appear in many instances to lay it down as an axiom, that the practice is a violation of the law of God. Should Congress in legislative capacity adopt the sentiment, it would establish the principle that the Legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. It would involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced, it will be impossible to define its bounds.*AMS June 1888, page 45.1

“Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely with-held from our Government the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions. Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object, are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort of the kind calls for the establishment of a principle, which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations

*furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.*AMS June 1888, page 45.2

“Under the present regulations of the Post-office Department, the rights of conscience are not invaded. Every agent enters voluntarily, and it is presumed conscientiously, into the discharge of his duties, without intermeddling with the conscience of another. Post-offices are so regulated that but a small proportion of the first day of the week is required to be occupied in official business. In the transportation of the mail on that day, no one agent is employed many hours. Religious persons enter into the business without violating their own consciences or imposing any restraints upon others. Passengers in the mail stages are free to rest during the first day of the week, or to pursue their journeys at their own pleasure. While the mail is transported on Saturday, the Jew and the Sabbatarian may abstain from any agency in carrying it, on conscientious scruples. While it is transported on the first day of the week, another class may abstain, from the same religious scruples. The obligation of Government is the same on both these classes; and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other; unless it be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority.”AMS June 1888, page 45.3

“It is the opinion of the committee that the subject should be regarded simply as a question of expediency, irrespective of its religious bearing. In this light it has hitherto been considered. Congress has never legislated upon the subject. It rests, as it ever has done, in the legal discretion of the Postmaster-General, under the repeated refusals of Congress to discontinue the Sabbath mails. His knowledge and judgment in all the concerns of that department, will not be questioned. His intense labors and assiduity have resulted in the highest improvement of every branch of his department. It is practiced only on the great leading mail routes, and such others as are necessary to maintain their connections. To prevent this, would, in the opinion of the committee, be productive of immense injury, both in its commercial and political, and also its moral bearings. The various departments of government require, frequently in peace, always in war, the speediest intercourse with the remotest parts of the country; and one important object of the

mail establishment is to furnish the greatest and most economical facilities for such intercourse. The delay of the mails one whole day in seven would require the employment of special expresses, at great expense, and sometimes with great uncertainty.*AMS June 1888, page 45.4*

“The commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of the country are so intimately connected as to require a constant and most expeditious correspondence betwixt all our seaports, and betwixt them and the most interior settlements. The delay of the mails during the Sunday would give occasion for the employment of private expresses, to such an amount that probably ten riders would be employed where one mail stage would be running on that day, thus diverting the revenue of that department in-to another channel, and sinking the establishment into a state of pusillanimity incompatible with the dignity of the Government of which it is a department.*AMS June 1888, page 45.5*

“Passengers in the mail stages, if the mails are not permitted to proceed on Sunday, will be expected to spend that day at a tavern upon the road, generally under circumstances not friendly to devotion, and at an expense which many are but poorly able to encounter. To obviate these difficulties, many will employ extra carriages for their conveyance, and become the bearers of correspondence, as more expeditious than the mail. The stage proprietors will themselves often furnish the travelers with those means of conveyance; so that the effect will ultimately be only to stop the mail, while the vehicle which conveys it will continue, and its passengers become the special messengers for conveying a considerable portion of what otherwise constitutes the contents of the mail. Nor can the committee discover where the system could consistently end. If the observance of a holiday becomes incorporated in our institutions, shall we not forbid the movement of an army; prohibit an assault in time of war; and lay an injunction upon our naval officers to lie in the wind while upon the ocean on that day? Consistency would seem to require it. Nor is it certain that we should stop here. *If the principle is once established, that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum.* We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for worship of the

Creator, and for the support of Christian ministers, if we believe such measures will promote the interests of Christianity. It is the settled, conviction of the committee, that the only method of avoiding these consequences, with their attendant train of evils, is to adhere strictly to the spirit of the Constitution, which regards the general Government in no other light than that of a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority. *What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which Government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them.*AMS June 1888, page 45.6

“Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World.”AMS June 1888, page 45.7

“Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion, for enforcing religious observances. Let the professors of Christianity recommend their religion by deeds of benevolence, by Christian meekness, by lives of temperance and holiness. Let them combine their efforts to instruct the ignorant, to relieve the widow and the orphan, to promulgate to the world the gospel of their Saviour, recommending its precepts by their habitual example; Government will find its legitimate object in protecting them. It cannot oppose them, and they will not need its aid. *Their moral influence will then do infinitely more to advance the true interests of religion, than any measure which they may call on Congress to enact.* The petitioners do not complain of any infringement upon their own rights. They enjoy all that Christians ought to ask at the hands of any Government-protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments.”AMS June 1888, page 45.8

“Resolved, That the committee be discharged from any further consideration of the subject.”AMS June 1888, page 45.9

E. J. Waggoner., “Another ‘Open Letter’” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that in the February Sentinel we replied to an "open letter" to us from Rev. W. T. McConnell, of Youngstown, Ohio. In the *Christian Nation* of February 29, Mr. McConnell wrote to us another open letter, which we have not till now had the opportunity to notice. As in his first "open letter" he started out with the stock argument of the National Reformers-that of classing with infidels, atheists, liquor leagues, liberal leagues, etc., etc., every opponent, whoever he may be or whatever may be the grounds of his opposition-so in this "open letter" the first thing he does is to enter upon a long defense of it. But he need not have done that at all; we did not mention it with the object of having it enter as an element into the controversy between us and the National Reformers. As Mr. McConnell was a new champion in the lists, we simply called his attention to this point to see whether we might not be able to get from him some sort of an argument upon the merits of the controversy between us. But our effort was in vain. Mr. McConnell proves to be as destitute of argument on the merits of the controversy as are all the rest of the National Reformers.*AMS June 1888, page 46.1*

From the beginning we have invited the National Reformers, both as individuals and by their organs, to show wherein our opposition to the National Reform movement is not based upon sound principles. We have asked them repeatedly to show wherein our arguments against it are faulty, or wherein our conclusions are illogical. We have offered them our own columns in which to show this. But with a single exception-Rev. Robert White, of Steubenville-the principal, the first, the leading reply, has always been to call us names and to class us with all the elements of wickedness that they can think of. But we do not care for that. We know that "it is only in the absence of argument that recourse is had to ridicule; and that the chair of the scoffer is never filled until that of the logician is vacated." Therefore, as the National Reformers are destitute of arguments against us, we couldn't have the heart to deprive them of their only recourse-that of calling us names. We are not what they call us; and we know that their calling us bad names does not make us what they call us.*AMS June 1888, page 46.2*

In his first “open letter” it will be remembered that Mr. McConnell likened the National Reform movement to an express train which is fairly to knock into Hinders everybody who does not get off the track. In reply we freely confessed that “the National Reform movement is nothing but a Satanic car of Juggernaut that proposes relentlessly to crush every person who chooses to think for himself.” This sets Mr. McConnell’s imagination all aglow, and he says:-*AMS June 1888, page 46.3*

“Now, neighbor, let us step one side and take a look at this ‘Satanic car’...There is the venerable Mr. Brunot holding the lines [yes, he is], while Doctors Stevenson, Barr, and McAllister urge on the high-spirited district secretaries, who are straining every nerve to increase its speed [yes, they are]. Then notice the material of which the ‘car’ is composed. Its wheels and axles, its panels and arches, its furniture and adornments, are the names of men.”*AMS June 1888, page 46.4*

The “names of men!” Yes, that is true, and a goodly number of those names are the names of dead men; others are the names of men who are decidedly opposed to the whole National Reform movement; others are the names of men who are not in the United States at all, and do not belong to the United States; others are names of men as living in certain places, while those men are not only not in those places but are not known there at all. Yes, sir, Mr. McConnell, that is a happy hit that you make, in saying that these were the names of men. We personally know that what we have here said is true. We know that the National Reform Association’s Executive Committee in its very latest published list of vice-presidents has printed the names of men who have been dead for years.*AMS June 1888, page 47.1*

Then Mr. McConnell makes great ado, because we confessed his destructive express to be a Satanic car.*AMS June 1888, page 47.2*

To this we have just a word to say. Doctor Philip Schaff says:-*AMS June 1888, page 47.3*

“Secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church.”-*Church and State in the United States, page 11.AMS June 1888, page 47.4*

Now secular power is precisely what the National Reform Association proposes to give to the church; therefore the National Reform Association proposes to make a Satanic gift to the church. And as Mr. McConnell proposes that this Satanic gift shall be in the form of an express car upon which the church shall ride in her course of tyranny and destruction, then it is demonstrated by Doctor Schaff's sound principle, and by Mr. McConnell's sounding proposition, that that car is a Satanic car.*AMS June 1888, page 47.5*

"National Reform in the Public Schools" American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that last summer the Saratoga National Reform Convention announced its willingness to put the Catholic Bible, Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, into the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority, if the Catholics would help the Protestants to put the Bible and religious instruction and worship in the public schools. It will also be remembered that the convention commissioned Secretary T. P. Stevenson to secure if possible the co-operation of the Roman Catholic authorities upon this basis. We showed at the time that if the Romish Church should accept this proposition, and the scheme should carry, it would at once place the public schools of ten States and four Territories bodily in the hands of the Catholic Church. We showed that two of these States are Minnesota and Wisconsin. The following from a late number of the *New York Evening Post* shows that in those States Rome is pushing the matter on her own account:-*AMS June 1888, page 47.6*

"The Roman Catholics of the Northwest appear to be making a carefully planned war upon the public-school system, and they are meeting with enough success in isolated cases to arouse general interest in the question. In one district in the town of Barton, Wis., the Catholics rallied in force at the annual meeting last year, and *carried a resolution that no public school should be maintained during the year; and none was held.* This year the contest was renewed, but the Catholics took advantage of the new law giving women the right to vote at school elections, to bring out all their

women, and carried the same resolution again. At Melrose, Minn., the Catholic priests engineered a movement to *shorten the school year of the public schools, in order to compel children to attend a parochial school*. Throughout Stearns County, Minn., the *Roman Catechism* is said to be *taught openly in the public schools, and either the opening or the closing hours of the session are devoted to religious instruction given by the priest*, all this being in direct violation of the State constitution, and especially of an amendment adopted in 1877, to meet this very condition. Most of this work has been done so quietly as not to attract wide attention, but the evidences of a determined assault upon the public-school system are now so clear that its friends are becoming aroused to the necessity of action.”*AMS June 1888, page 47.7*

This piece of news will doubtless greatly encourage Mr. Stevenson and his constituents. And, at the same time, it ought to arouse every lover of American institutions-every lover of civil and religious liberty-to the most vigilant watchfulness in every State in the Union. But will it?*AMS June 1888, page 47.8*

“Back Page” American Sentinel 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

Doctor Crafts says of the Sunday in politics:-*AMS June 1888, page 47.9*

“Its enemies have already attacked it on the field of politics.”*AMS June 1888, page 47.10*

But “its enemies” never attacked it on the field of politics until its friends attempted to sustain it on the field of politics. The first advances into the field of politics were by the Sunday-law forces, the gauntlet was by them first thrown down upon the political field, and if “its enemies” accepted the challenge, its friends have but themselves to blame.*AMS June 1888, page 47.11*

In the matter between England and Ireland the Pope has spoken, and has spoken in favor of England, as was the foregone conclusion, because on the side of England is power, and it is

official recognition by the power of England which just now the Pope wants more than any other imaginable thing. Besides this, the Pope knows that Catholic Ireland is forever secure to the Papacy whatever he may do, and therefore he can afford to traffic with England at Ireland's expense to any extent that the necessities of the case may demand. If consistency were an attribute of the Papacy, then consistency would demand that the Pope should have decided this question just as he did, because it was the Pope who first gave Ireland to England. But the question of consistency never enters into any action of the Papacy; the sole question always is, What will advance the interests of the Papacy? And as now the supreme consideration is to secure the recognition of the Pope as a sovereign, England must be favored.*AMS June 1888, page 47.12*

In his argument before the Senate Committee in behalf of National Sunday legislation, Dr. Crafts started out with the statement that,-*AMS June 1888, page 47.13*

"A national evil requires a national remedy."*AMS June 1888, page 47.14*

Well, that depends. If it be meant by this that any evil that is as widespread as is the Nation, must be met by a remedy that is as widespread as is the Nation; or if it be meant that an evil done by the national power, should be remedied by the national power-then, very good, that is only to say that the plaster must cover the sore, and is self-evident. But if it be meant that any evil that is as widespread as is the Nation must be met by a remedy applied by national power, then no proposition can be more fallacious. It might very properly be said that covetousness and selfish greed is a national evil, but no remedy that could ever be applied by national power could effect anything at all toward curing the evil. Sin might be said to be a national evil-it is as much so as many of the things which Mr. Crafts mentions-but no remedy that can ever be applied by national power can affect sin in any way but to increase it. From Mr. Crafts's whole argument, it is evident that it is in this latter sense that his proposition is to be understood. But a moment's thought shows that the proposition as meant is to be taken with decided limitations. National evils require national remedies only when those evils are such as to be within the just province of civil

government; and such the Sunday question is not in any of its forms.*AMS June 1888, page 47.15*

Passing by a cigar stand the other day, we saw in bold letters the following free advice: "Smoke Sanitary Cigars!" and straightway we began to wonder what kind of cigars sanitary cigars could be. We could not think of anything that could make cigars healthful except the absence of tobacco, and that evidently was not what the enterprising cigar vender meant to suggest. Finally we concluded that sanitary cigars are just the ordinary vile compounds that we meet on the cars and the ferry-boats, and that their sanitary property is the same as that of certain "disinfectants,"-they smell so bad that people are forced to open the windows, and so they get a little fresh air. Even with that view, we think that "sanitary cigars" are a failure, for they usually smell bad enough to vitiate all the air in the neighborhood. Ordinary air stands no show in the presence of a dozen men with cigars.*AMS June 1888, page 47.16*

The Christian Union's Chicago correspondent, commenting on the fact that Dr. Fulton was not allowed by the city authorities to fill his appointment to lecture on the topic, "Is Popery in the Way?" because they feared a riot, thinks that refusal was unnecessary, and adds: "It surely is a dishonor to the Catholic Church if it is supposed that bloodshed would result if ever so violent addresses were made against it." Indeed it is a dishonor to that church, and a dishonor which it has brought upon itself many times. The Catholic Church has had about fourteen centuries of such dishonor, for everybody who knows anything about that church knows that when it has had the power it has never hesitated to shed the blood of those who spoke against it. No man's life would be safe if he should go into any community in the United States, where the Catholics are numerous, and should openly tell the truth concerning that church. A false religion has no other argument at its command but violence.*AMS June 1888, page 47.17*

The following item from the Michigan Christian Advocate, which came to our notice just after the above was written, is a very good comment on the Christian Union's statement that the Catholic Church is too good to cause blood to flow in consequence of addresses made against it:*AMS June 1888, page 47.18*

“Michael Welch was telling a Gladwin audience why he left the Catholic Church, when a party of men entered the room, and informing him that they were after blood, began throwing bottles at his head.”*AMS June 1888, page 47.19*

An apparently specious argument in favor of Sunday legislation, and one eminently satisfactory to those who make it, is this:-*AMS June 1888, page 47.20*

“The liberty of rest for each demands a law of rest for all.”*AMS June 1888, page 47.21*

Here are some kindred propositions: The liberty of worship for each demands a law of worship for all. The liberty of prayer for each demands a law of prayer for all. The liberty of singing psalms for each demands a law of singing psalms for all. The liberty of going to church for each demands a law of going to church for all. And thus we might extend such propositions to an in-finite length, every one of them being just as sound as is the one set forth by those Sunday-law advocates. The truth is that the liberty of rest for each demands nothing at all, unless it be that each shall be allowed to exercise his liberty or not, just as he in his liberty chooses. The proposition that “the liberty of rest for each demands a law of rest for all,” is a palpable absurdity. What these Sunday-law advocates mean to say is about as follows: We, in the exercise of our liberty of rest, demand a law that shall compel everybody else to rest just as we do. They will probably get their law in the end, but they will never accomplish their purpose with it, even though they do get it.*AMS June 1888, page 47.22*

Not long since in the town of Livermore, California, a Catholic boy named Michael Hartigan went to a base-ball game instead of going to Catholic Church one Sunday. In the afternoon of the same day the boy met the Catholic priest in the road, when the priest took him severely to task in the way of a tongue-lashing, and finished it off by beating him with a cane. It is into the hands of such religious worthies as this, that the Sunday-law advocates want to put the power to prosecute everybody who does not choose to keep Sunday as they shall dictate. We are happy to announce that the priest was convicted of battery. But when everybody's actions on

Sunday shall, by law, be made subject to the officious surveillance of such religious meddlers as this, then what protection, what security, will there be for anybody?*AMS June 1888, page 47.23*

July 1888

“A Sensible Letter” American Sentinel 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent letter from a town in Northern California ordering the Sentinel for a public reading-room, the writer, evidently a gentleman of intelligence, takes the occasion to thus express himself in reference to our work:-*AMS July 1888, page 48.1*

“I think your arguments are unanswerable, and the position you take in reference to the union of Church and State is the only safe one. It is for the best interests of all the people, and of all religious denominations as well.*AMS July 1888, page 48.2*

“There is no doubt in my mind that some of the leaders of the W.C.T.U. favor the designs of the National Reformers, but the great majority of the members do not understand the matter at all. I am a Prohibitionist, and I am satisfied that the National Reform Association would like to use the Prohibition party in the furtherance of their designs; but I am fully convinced that there are very few Prohibitionists that are aware of the fact.*AMS July 1888, page 48.3*

“I am decidedly opposed to the Prohibition party’s adopting a Sunday-law plank; (1) because it can do no good religiously, and (2) because it is a great mistake politically. The Prohibition party was organized to close the saloons seven days in the week, and on this Prohibitionists are agreed, but on the Sunday-law question they are not agreed, nor can they be. The adoption of that as a party measure would, in my judgment, divide the party and render success impossible.*AMS July 1888, page 48.4*

“I wish that the Sentinel could be placed in the hands of Prohibitionists everywhere; and especially that it could be read by the editors of all Prohibition papers.”*AMS July 1888, page 48.5*

Our correspondent has expressed the thing exactly. The National Reform Association intends to make use of the Prohibition party, but Prohibitionists are not generally aware of that fact. In this very

ignorance lies the danger. We propose to show them the danger, so that those who are really desirous of reform may not be used to further a movement which will have the semblance of all reforms, and lack the substance of any.*AMS July 1888, page 48.6*

“The Entering Wedge” American Sentinel 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

Through the courtesy of the introducer, Senator Blair, we have copies of a bill and a resolution which have recently been introduced into the United States Senate, which will interest the readers of the Sentinel, and should arouse the attention of every person in the country. We think it of the utmost importance that these be thoroughly studied, and so we print them in full. The first which we present is a “Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools.” The Resolution is dated May 25, and has been read twice, and ordered to lie on the table. It reads thus:-*AMS July 1888, page 49.1*

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-third of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:-AMS July 1888, page 49.2

ARTICLE

Section 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*AMS July 1888, page 49.3*

Sec. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money

raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.*AMS July 1888, page 49.4*

Sec. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.*AMS July 1888, page 49.5*

Sec. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.*AMS July 1888, page 49.6*

We find no fault with this Resolution save in one particular, and that is the provision that free public schools, established and maintained by the State, shall be established and maintained “for the education of all the children living therein... in the principles of the Christian religion.” We have no idea that the amendment proposed will ever be adopted, for it too strongly maintains the necessity of the public schools being free from denominational control, and of the denominational school being deprived of State patronage, to suit the Catholics, and no political measure which the Catholics oppose can carry in this country. But while this is so, there is great danger that by means of the introduction of such resolutions, our legislators will become so familiarized with the idea of religious legislation that it will not appear to be the unrighteous thing that it is.*AMS July 1888, page 49.7*

It is as Christians as well as American citizens, that we stand opposed to any proposition for the State to maintain public schools wherein children shall be taught “the principles of the Christian religion.” We think that it calls for opposition from Christians more

strongly than from any other people. We have so often set forth the principles which condemn such legislation, and those principles are so simple, that it should be unnecessary to repeat them; but often things that are simple are overlooked because of their very simplicity, so we note the following points which should be applied by every citizen, not only to this resolution, but to every one of a similar nature.*AMS July 1888, page 49.8*

The resolution is directly opposed to the first amendment to the Constitution, which says that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” If it be said that the resolution does not mention an establishment of religion, we reply that for the State to teach Christianity would be most emphatically to effect an establishment of religion; for Christianity is nothing if it is not religion. If it is not religion, what is it? The plain intent of that amendment is that Congress shall do nothing whatever that will tend to influence any man’s religious belief or practice, whether he be Christian, Jew, Pagan, or infidel. In short, it was designed to set forth the truth that with religion the State has nothing whatever to do.*AMS July 1888, page 49.9*

What are the principles of the Christian religion? Some will reply that they are the principles of common morality; that the design in requiring the principles of the Christian religion to be taught in the public schools, is to have the rising generation imbued with the principles of honesty, kindness, and courtesy. But this is not the case; the very language of the resolution shows this. It requires that the children shall be instructed “in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion.” It will be seen that the fact is recognized that the principles of the Christian religion are something distinct from the principles of common virtue and morality.*AMS July 1888, page 49.10*

The Christian religion is the gospel of Jesus Christ. The gospel of Jesus Christ is, as the apostle Paul says, “the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth.” In other words, it is the remedy which God has devised to save men from the guilt, the love, and the consequences of sin, and it accomplishes this salvation only for those who exercise personal faith in Christ. Now the very

statement that the gospel is a *remedy*, is an acknowledgement that something existed before it did, which called for a remedy. That something was sin. But sin is immorality, the violation of God's moral law. Therefore it is as clear as noonday, that the principles of virtue and morality are older than the Christian religion. If those principles had from the beginning been strictly followed, the Christian religion would never have been introduced, because there would have been no sin from which to save men. Those principles are to a greater or less extent known and inculcated in all nations, and by all systems of religion. They are a part of the legacy which all men have inherited from their common parent, Adam.*AMS July 1888, page 50.1*

That children should always and everywhere be impressed with the importance of honesty, truthfulness, courtesy, and kindness to one another, there is no one who will deny. No one will question the right and the duty of the public schools to teach these principles. This it may do and not teach religion, although these are necessary to religion. But to teach "the principles of the Christian religion," in the public schools, means that just such instruction should be given in those schools as is given in the Sabbath-schools of the land. It means that the children should be instructed in the nature of the sacrifice of Christ, which is so simple that any child may understand it, and should be taught the necessity of personal faith in him, and should also be instructed in regard to those ordinances which Christ instituted as media for the manifestation of faith, namely, Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper. This, and this alone, is instruction in the principles of the Christian religion.*AMS July 1888, page 50.2*

Well, isn't it right that children should be so instructed? We say, Yes; it is right, and most necessary; but *not in the public schools*. Personally we earnestly wish that every child in the land could be brought directly under the influence of Christian teaching, but we would have it done in a way befitting Christianity. The gospel knows nothing of force. Christ never forced him-self upon anybody. When the Gadarenes besought him to depart out of their coasts, he went immediately. Why? Was it because he was not as intensely interested in them as in the inhabitants of Galilee? Not at all; but because he recognized their right to reject him and his teachings if they chose. When he sent out his disciples, he gave them

instruction to the same effect. If any should refuse to receive them, they were to leave them, and allow the day of Judgment to settle with them for their willful rejection of the gospel. We repeat, The gospel knows nothing of force; its cry is, "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." The privilege of every man to freely accept the provisions of God's grace, implies the equal privilege of every man to reject them. Religion that is not voluntary is of no value.*AMS July 1888, page 50.3*

But when religion is taught in the public schools, it ceases to be a voluntary thing. The State then uses its power to force the gospel upon people. It gathers all the children into the schools, and then preaches the gospel to them. But under such circumstances it is not the gospel that is received; it is only a semblance of the gospel. Nothing is pure gospel except that which is truly Christ-like, and Christ never forced people to listen to him. The same power which drove the money-changers in abject terror from the temple, could as well have gathered all people regularly into the temple, or the synagogues, and compelled them to listen to his teaching. The fact that the great Author of Christianity employed nothing like force in the introduction of Christianity, shows that none of his professed followers have any right to use force in maintaining it. The disciple is not greater than his Lord. It is right to have zeal for God, and to be anxious that all men should hear the gospel; but that zeal should be according to knowledge. It should not lead to the adoption of methods which Christ condemned. To say that if the State does not use its power to cause people to be instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, it is evidence of indifference as to their eternal welfare, is equivalent to saying that Christ was indifferent, because he did not use his greater power for the same purpose.*AMS July 1888, page 50.4*

We trust that every reader can see that our opposition to the teaching of the Christian religion in the public schools, is not simply on the ground that it is unconstitutional, - that it discriminates between the believer and the unbeliever, not allowing the unbeliever equal rights with the believer. We do oppose it on that ground. To compel the infidel against his will to have his children instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, just because his Christian neighbor wants his children to be so instructed, is to say

that the infidel has not as much right in this country as the Christian has, and that is to make the rights of citizenship dependent upon one's belief. Surely this is reason enough for opposing it; but we have a higher reason still, and that is that such a course is antichristian as well as un-American.*AMS July 1888, page 50.5*

We use the term "antichristian" advisedly. We have already shown that all enforced teaching of the gospel is contrary to the example and precept of Christ. History is full of illustrations of the antichristian effect of enforced religious teaching. When Charlemagne conquered the Saxons, their lives were spared on condition that they would receive baptism. Says Guizot, "For three years Charlemagne had to redouble his efforts to accomplish in Saxony, at the cost of Frankish as well as Saxon blood, his work of conquest and conversion. 'Saxony,' he often repeated, 'must be Christianized or wiped out.'" Now does anybody suppose that there was any Christianity involved in the enforced baptism of the Saxons? Does not everybody know that it was by just such processes that the Papacy, the human embodiment of antichrist, was established? The illustration on page 215 of the first volume of Guizot's "History of France" (Estes and Lauriat's edition), is well named "Charlemagne inflicting baptism upon the Saxons."*AMS July 1888, page 50.6*

The difference between this enforced acceptance of Christianity, and the teaching of "the principles of the Christian religion" in the public schools of the United States, is one of degree only, and not one of kind. The principle is the same. When instruction in the principles of religion becomes a matter of compulsion, then Christianity itself will take its leave. We submit that Christ knew how to propagate Christianity better than any man can. His gentle methods were the best and the only right way. And so it is because of our love for pure Christianity, as well as our love for equal rights to all men, that we oppose the propagation of religion by the State. E.J.W.*AMS July 1888, page 50.7*

"The Church and State Bill" American Sentinel 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The “bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship,” was introduced into the Senate May 21, was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, where it was championed by Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts and others. It reads as follows:-*AMS July 1888, page 50.8*

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.**AMS July 1888, page 50.9*

Sec. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: And provided further, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.*AMS July 1888, page 50.10*

Sec. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.*AMS July 1888, page 51.1*

Sec. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.*AMS July 1888, page 51.2*

Sec. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.*AMS July 1888, page 51.3*

Sec. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and ex-posed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by

local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.*AMS July 1888, page 51.4*

We are at a loss to know how to arouse the people to a proper appreciation of the evil of allowing such a bill to become a law. The American people have become so thoroughly imbued with the idea that this is a free country, that the blessings of liberty were forever secured to us by the founders of this Government,-that it seems impossible to make them believe that they can by any possibility be deprived of that liberty. So they will sit at ease while the cords are being drawn around them, which will hold them in a bondage as great as that which compelled the Pilgrim Fathers to flee from their native land.*AMS July 1888, page 51.5*

We wish it distinctly understood that we do not charge anybody with intentional wrong; that is not our business. We are willing to allow that the framers, the introducer, and the champions of this bill acted in good faith, to the best of their knowledge. But the evil will be none the less, because those who establish it think that they are acting for the best good of the country. If the bill were entitled, "A Bill to Unite Church and State in the United States," it would only declare on its face just what it really is.*AMS July 1888, page 51.6*

How can it need any argument to convince any thoughtful person that this bill is directly in favor of an establishment of religion, and does therefore really prohibit the free exercise thereof? We verily believe that the only reason the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has not been overwhelmed with protests against this bill, is because the people are ignorant of its provisions. It does not seem possible that people could, without protest, allow it to come so near being put upon its final passage, if they knew what it is.*AMS July 1888, page 51.7*

We do not need to argue that this bill contemplates a law respecting an establishment of religion, for it makes an express declaration to that effect. It is to promote the observance of the first day of the

week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of religious worship. If the passage of such a law would not mark the consummation of the union between Church and State, we should like to have some of the wise men tell us what would. If it would not, then there never was such a thing. The so-called National Reformers will tell us that a union of Church and State can be brought about only by the State bestowing its patronage upon, and elevating some particular denomination; and they say that they do not want this. Of course they don't; and if that is the only thing that constitutes Church and State union, then there never was any such union, and we must find some other name by which to designate the condition of things that existed in Europe from the days of Constantine till the Reformation, and in some portions of Europe till now. Constantine elevated, not a sect, but Christianity to the throne of the world. The church stands for religion. Religion and the church are inseparably connected. There cannot be one without the other, although the religion may be grossly corrupt, or wholly perverted. And so when religion and religious practices are upheld by the State, there is a complete union of Church and State.*AMS July 1888, page 51.8*

Take our public schools as an illustration. It is rightly held that our common-school system is a part of our Government. Why? Because the State protects and upholds the schools and education. In our Government, education and the State are inseparable. It is held that whatever influence works to undermine our schools, is working to the same degree to undermine our Government, for a republican form of government cannot exist where the rank and file of the people - the real governors-are ignorant. Now the National Reformers claim that without some such law as is proposed by the bill,-a law to establish religion and religious observances, this country cannot long continue. Thus they claim that religion must be as closely connected with this Government as is the cause of education.*AMS July 1888, page 51.9*

Some will doubtless question our statement that the provisions of this bill not only contemplate an establishment of religion, but the prohibition of the free exercise thereof. But whenever a law is made respecting an establishment of religion, somebody's free exercise thereof must of necessity be interfered with, except in the

unsupposable case that all believe exactly alike. Now take the bearing of this law upon those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the only Lord's day, and who as conscientiously regard the first day of the week as an ordinary working day. It will be said that the bill does not prohibit them from keeping holy the seventh day, and therefore does not interfere with their religion, but this is only a one-sided view. Let us briefly consider the whole matter.*AMS July 1888, page 51.10*

Those who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, do so in obedience to the strict letter of the fourth commandment, which says, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." *Exodus 20:8-10*. In this commandment the Lord expressly claims the seventh day as his day, so that the first day of the week, "commonly called the Lord's day," is not the Lord's day at all. He also commands that the seventh day shall be kept holy to him, but freely gives to man the other six days as working days. Now whether all admit that the fourth commandment limits the Sabbath to the seventh day of the week, or whether they hold that it sanctifies any seventh part of time that men choose to keep, all must admit that it gives men the privilege of working six days. That is, men have the same authority for working on six days of the week that they have for resting on the seventh.*AMS July 1888, page 51.11*

Suppose now that this bill becomes a law, and those who conscientiously keep the seventh day are required to keep the first also. Then we say that they are interfered with in the free exercise of their religion. So far as this argument is concerned, it makes no difference whether they are right or wrong in their interpretation of the commandment. Their religion requires them to keep the seventh day; the law of God allows them six days in which to labor, and their necessities require them to devote the whole six days to labor. To force them to keep the first day would be not only to interfere with their God-given privilege of working six days, but also, by taking advantage of their necessities, to compel them to labor on the seventh day, thus doing violence to their consciences. That is, providing they yielded obedience to the law. Surely this would be to prohibit the free exercise of religion. And when the penalty of the

law should be inflicted upon those who should rest on the seventh day and labor on the first, it would be punishment inflicted because of their religious belief, and that is religious persecution. So surely as this bill becomes a law, religious persecution will disgrace this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.*AMS July 1888, page 51.12*

Again, some will say that the same plea could with equal propriety be made in behalf of the Mormons, when they are indicted for practicing polygamy. We say, No. The cases are not parallel to the slightest extent. Polygamy is a sin against society. It inflicts cruel wrongs upon thousands of people. The Judgment-day alone will reveal the murders that have been committed, and the hearts that have been broken, as the direct result of polygamy. Many a loving and trusting wife has died of a broken heart, or has been transformed into a demon of hate, because another was brought in to occupy the place sacred to her alone. Polygamy interferes with the inalienable rights of every creature, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore it should be extirpated as a crime.*AMS July 1888, page 52.1*

But the keeping of the seventh day and the secularization of the first is nothing of the kind. The man who works on the first day of the week does not hinder anybody else from resting. Of course it is understood that such work shall not disturb any religious assembly. But a law protecting religious and all other assemblies already exists, so that a Sunday law is not needed on that score. That Sunday work by seventh-day people does not interfere with Sunday rest by others is shown by the fact that there are over fifty thousand people in this country who religiously and sacredly keep the seventh day of the week, in spite of the fact that over fifty millions of their fellows are laboring on that day. Yet we never heard a complaint by a Sabbatarian, nor a request for a law to secure to him his Sabbath.*AMS July 1888, page 52.2*

It is said that the workingmen must have a day of rest secured to them. The workingmen can have a day of rest if they want to take it. Those who keep the seventh day are nearly all workingmen, but nobody compels them to labor on Saturday. If the workingmen of this country didn't want to work on Sunday, there is no power that could compel them to. If they should individually and collectively

declare that they want Sunday as a rest day, and are determined not to labor on that day, the problem would settle itself.*AMS July 1888, page 52.3*

But they don't care for the rest. The ones who are clamoring for the Sunday law are not the workingmen but the ministers. Read the bill carefully, and you will see that it is worded so as to specially guard the hours of worship. When it becomes absolutely necessary to handle the mails on Sunday it must be during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience, and *least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest.*" The bill is in behalf not simply of an establishment of religion, but of the churches. And if it should become a law, and it should be found, as it certainly would be, that the churches were not filled in consequence, the next thing would be a law to compel these indifferent ones to attend church. And this law would be declared to be a law in behalf of the workingmen, and not at all in behalf of religion. Some may think that nobody would have the boldness to ask for such a law; but if they are countenanced in asking for a law requiring that children, many of whom attend Sabbath-school and receive religious instruction at home, should be instructed in the principles of the Christian religion at school, they would certainly be warranted in asking that the man who toils all the week without opportunity for moral or mental culture, should be required, for his own good, to listen to such instruction for an hour in the week.*AMS July 1888, page 52.4*

We might go on much farther with this subject, but lack of space forbids. Compared with its merits, this is a very brief presentation of the case. We may have more to say upon it next month. But we earnestly hope that those who love liberty and pure Christianity will arouse to a sense of the danger, and not let these bills become laws without at least a strong protest. The time to act is now.*AMS July 1888, page 52.5*

E.J.W.

"Religion in Japan" American Sentinel 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

It is well known that much missionary work has been done in Japan, and that Christianity has been looked upon with favor by those high in authority; and it has been declared highly probable that the empire will ere long become officially "Christian." The emperor is expected, like Constantine of old, to declare Christianity to be the religion. This step has been looked for with a great deal of anxiety by those interested in foreign missions, as a wonderful victory for Christianity. We have before expressed our opinion on the subject, that if such a step is taken, it will be the worst thing that could possibly happen for real Christianity in Japan. The Christianity that would be adopted would be a formal religion, a matter of policy alone, and it would put an effectual stop to the growth of vital godliness. The empire would no longer be missionary ground, and the labors of devoted missionaries would soon cease. Those who accepted the State religion in obedience to the imperial edict, would be forever content with the form of religion, and so the last state of the empire would be worse than the first. We have no faith in charms, and we don't think that the name of Christianity will make a man or a nation any better than will the name or the reality of paganism.*AMS July 1888, page 53.1*

To show that our statement of the case is correct we copy the following London dispatch to the San Francisco Chronicle of June 10:*AMS July 1888, page 54.1*

"The *Japan Weekly Mail* in a recent issue summarizes the discussion now being carried on in Japan by several eminent publicists respecting the advisability of the people of that country embracing Christian religion. A movement, started by some very prominent persons, is on foot to give an impetus to the spread of Christianity by laying stress on the secondary benefits its acceptance insures. Those connected with the movement say that Christian dogmas are a bitter pill to swallow, but advise that it be swallowed promptly for the sake of the after effects. Fukuzawa, **American Sentinel* had the spelling "Fuka-Zawa," but different copies of the same copied article, and other sources, prove that the correct spelling of the name is "Fukuzawa." a well-known writer, urges this course, although he says he takes no personal interest whatever in religion, and knows nothing of the teachings of Christianity, but he sees that it is the creed of highly civilized nations. To him religion is

only a garment to be put on or taken off for pleasure, but he thinks it prudent that Japan assume the same dress as that of her neighbors, with whom she desires to stand well.*AMS July 1888, page 54.2*

“Professor Toyama,”*American Sentinel* had the spelling “Toyma,” but different copies of the same copied article, and other sources, prove that the correct spelling of the name is “Toyama.” of the Imperial University, has published a work to support this view. He holds that Chinese ethics must be replaced by Christian ethics, and that the benefits to be derived from the introduction of Christianity are: (1) The improvement of music;*American Sentinel* had the words “the mind,” but different copies of the same copied article prove that the correct word is “music.” (2) a unit of sentiment and feeling leading to harmonious co-operation; (3) furnishing a medium of intercourse between men and women. Mr. Kato, the late president^{*}*American Sentinel* had the wording “Kabolat,” but different copies of the same copied article, and other sources, prove that the correct wording is “Mr. Kato, the late president” of the Imperial University, who says that religion is not needed for the educated, and confesses his dislike to all religion, urges the introduction of religious teachings in the Government schools on the ground that the unlearned in Japan have their faith in the old moral standards shaken, and that there is now a serious lack of moral sentiment among the masses.”*AMS July 1888, page 54.3*

And that is just as high as the standard of religion would be in this country if Christianity were declared to be the national religion. A State religion never was and never will be adopted except from selfish motives.*AMS July 1888, page 54.4*

“**Very Gracious**” **American Sentinel 3, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

In an address to the National Reform Convention recently held in Philadelphia, Rev. J. A. Wylie said of the proposed Sunday law:-*AMS July 1888, page 53.1*

“It is true we meet with the plea that the rights of those who do not

wish to observe the Sabbath, are violated by such legislation as we claim, but these laws bind all alike, no discrimination is made in favor of any. Like the pressure of the atmosphere on the human body, no injury is produced, because all parts are affected alike. In regard to those who observe some other than the first day of the week as a day of sacred rest, the law should not prohibit this, and if their con-sciences require they should observe a different day, they may thank the law which secures to them an additional Sabbath every week.”*AMS July 1888, page 53.2*

The *Review and Herald*, of Battle Creek, Mich., is the organ of a large body of people who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, and the following from that paper shows how they regard the “gracious” utterance of Mr. Wylie:-*AMS July 1888, page 53.3*

“Isn’t this very liberal and beneficent! After keeping the true and only Sabbath according to the commandment of God, and the dictates of conscience, seventh-day observers ‘*may thank the law which secures to them an additional Sabbath.*’ Yes! thank the law which deprives them of one-sixth of their means of support! thank the law which would oblige them to pay a tax of sixteen and two-thirds per cent of their entire income to a hostile religious system! thank the law which steps in and unceremoniously takes from them one-sixth of the privilege and duty granted them alike by God and nature, of healthful and often necessary six days’ labor! thank the law which compels them to pay honor to an institution which they know is founded in falsehood, and antagonizes the law of the great Jehovah! The doctor of divinity who represents this view of the matter may think seventh-day people are such phenomenal fools that they will rush up and in the ecstasy of their gratitude hug and kiss an old Moloch like this. But we think we know them better.”*AMS July 1888, page 53.4*

“Let us test the matter in a clearly supposable case: Suppose Mr. Wylie, who formulates this proposition, is called upon to go as a missionary to some heathen land. They have their false gods; he worships the true. Let us suppose further, that the heathen are found so bigoted as to enforce by law the worship of some one of their chief gods upon all the people. Mr. Wylie objects on the ground that his conscience requires him to worship the true God

alone. They reply, ‘We do not prohibit this. If your conscience requires you to worship that God, that is your privilege; but, having done this, you may *thank our law*, Mr. Wylie, *which secures to you an Additional God!* And, remember, this law is binding on all alike; there is no discrimination made in favor of any. Like the pressure of the atmosphere on the human body, *no injury is produced, because all parts are affected alike!*’ How would Mr. Wylie fancy that situation, and that way of reasoning to support it?” *AMS July 1888, page 53.5*

We are very sure that Mr. Wylie would write most pathetic and indignant letters about the religious intolerance of that country. It makes a great deal of difference whose ox is gored. The proposed law will not incommode Mr. Wylie, and so what reason has anybody to complain? The colossal selfishness and impudence of the man are greater than words can express. *AMS July 1888, page 53.6*

It is evident that Mr. Wylie forgot his illustration of the equal pressure of the air, just as soon as he used it. It is true that there is perfect ease so long as the air presses equally on every part; but just let one portion of the body be subjected to double pressure, and there will be a continual sense of discomfort. And this equal pressure on every part is just what it is proposed to change. To one who should complain because he was subjected to double pressure, the National Reformers would say, “You ought rather to thank the man who has secured to you twice as much air as other people have.” He would doubtless fail to appreciate the kindness, and would prefer to take his air just as the Lord provided it for him, without having it tampered with by man. So long as men have Sabbath laws as God fixed them, there is no unequal pressure; but when they attempt to improve upon his plans they make trouble. *AMS July 1888, page 53.7*

“A Word of Warning” American Sentinel 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above heading, George W. Colles of Morristown, N. J., makes a vigorous protest in the Christian Union, of May 31, against the growing tendency of the churches not only to accept but to seek

aid from the State. It was drawn out by a previous article concerning the grasping nature of Romanism. Some may think his words too strong, but nothing but strong words will arouse anybody to the danger. Here are his words, and our readers can judge of them for themselves:-*AMS July 1888, page 53.8*

"I would like the writer as well as the readers of 'Breakers Ahead,' in your issue of May 17, to consider also how the Roman conspiracy against our liberties is assisted by Protestant short-sighted grasping of public funds for the support of their institutions. All ecclesiastics are alike, be they Romish, Protestant, Jewish, or pagan, in this: that they grasp at power, and, to get it, will put their feet through the Charter of Human Rights. The non-Romish institutions who yearly accept a share (however small) in the annual steal out of the public taxes know perfectly well that it is a steal, and that it shuts their mouths from saying a word to oppose the Romanists' grab, and that the priests throw them the sop for this very purpose; yet the dollars are hard enough to dispel their scruples, as well as to show what is their sincerity in adherence to American principles. The Church of Rome is by no means the only one which has no faith in human liberty; they *all* want to make the Government draw their individual loads. The most advanced Protestants are determined, if they can, to ecclesiasticize our Constitution and laws, and to destroy the equality before the law of all shades of thought, belief, and non-belief. When Protestant Christians acquire a deep-rooted and passionate love for the principle of absolute and entire separation of church from civil rule and from force, then, and not till then, can they as a unit oppose the hostile approaches of humanity's greatest enemy, the Roman conspiracy. This deep-rooted and passionate love for a high and absolutely vital principle does not now exist among Protestant churches as such; for they accept with smiles gifts and advantages that will in the end prove their own destruction.*AMS July 1888, page 53.9*

"History repeats itself. Just what we now are, enjoying a large measure of freedom, just so was Europe at one time. Just as Rome begins here now, she began in Europe-in Italy and in Spain. Just what Spain is to-day, we may be in a hundred years. Religion is one thing; its priests are quite another-merely men; at first animated with love for souls, and in their zeal seeing but a little way before them,

and but one thing at a time, and pushing to their aim over every merely temporal object. Afterward, they or their successors, less pure in motive, or exchanging the true worship for the worship of an institution, become the despots who are perpetually arising to overturn that liberty which they abuse. Grasping at public money is only one form of grasping at temporal power, just as grasping at the schools is another. It can only be on a righteous principle, faithfully adhered to by the patriotism of our Protestant bodies, acting as Americans, that the encroachments of Rome can be successfully withstood." *AMS July 1888, page 53.10*

"Woman Suffrage" American Sentinel 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

America is an excellent journal printed in Chicago. The *Dexter Gazette*, of Maine, asked America why it did not give itself "to the advocacy of the enfranchisement of the wives and daughters of the white race native of this country that have reached the years of understanding." In reply America gives some points which are worthy of careful consideration. Here they are:-*AMS July 1888, page 55.1*

"There is no call to discuss, much less to advocate, the enfranchisement of women throughout the republic. When that subject really presses to the front for solution, if it ever does, America will discuss it upon its merits. It will not permit any of that worshipful regard and admirable courtesy toward women, which is the honorable attitude of true Americans, to interfere with its view of the injurious effect the grant of the suffrage would have both upon the women themselves and the republic. It would take the position that nature has placed an insuperable barrier to equality of the sexes; that as the defense of the nation must ever devolve upon the men, the whole responsibility for the Government must always be intrusted to them. And if ever the question shall come squarely before the people, it will contend that not only the republic, but women and humanity, have nothing to gain at all commensurate with what they would lose through the obliteration of the line which makes man the responsible party in public affairs, as he must be in the family. Only cranks and sentimentalists talk about the

practicability of leaving men at home to rock the cradles and manage the cook, while women go forth to canvass the ward and run the political machine.*AMS July 1888, page 55.2*

When any newspaper advocates the enfranchisement of white native-born women only, it exposes what is the fallacy underlying the whole woman-suffrage movement, to wit, the possibility of discriminating between the wise and the foolish, the educated and the ignorant, the virtuous and the vicious, the white and the black. When it comes to enfranchising women, they will all have to be taken together. There can be no separating the sheep from the goats. It will have to be another case of fifteenth amendment. The right to vote will have to be extended to all women, unabridged by any condition on account of sex, character, color, or previous condition of disfranchisement.*AMS July 1888, page 55.3*

All advocacy of women suffrage is based on the theory that the exclusion of good women from the exercise of the franchise is detrimental not only to them but to the best interests of the republic. Common sense and experience teach that the influence of good women is decreased by the grant of the ballot, because they fail to avail themselves of it, while bad women and those under the control of depraved and ignorant men, are bold to seize upon the advantage for evil it affords. According to the United States census, the percentage of illiteracy is greater among females than among males, and if illiteracy were construed to include ignorance of principles of government and justice, the disparity would be almost beyond estimation. That there are many women better fitted mentally and morally to vote than millions of men must be conceded. But this begs the question. Until it can be shown that all women are equally equipped for the suffrage with all men, and that the virtuous among them would attend to their political duties more faith-fully than the majority of the men in their sphere in life do, where is the reason or expediency of the extension.*AMS July 1888, page 55.4*

“The question of extending the franchise to women will have to be discussed and settled not according to what a few women think, but upon broad principles as to the fitness, wisdom, and expediency of the revolution, for such it will be, as it affects the sexes, the

propagation of species, and the permanence of the American home and the American republic. Such joint resolutions as that introduced in the House of Representatives, 'by request,' by Congressman Mason, providing for a woman's suffrage amendment to the Constitution, are the sheerest buncombe. Not one intelligent woman in ten wants to be enfranchised, and scarcely one respectable woman in a hundred would use the ballot if placed in her hands." *AMS July 1888, page 55.5*

In the late Democratic Convention there was an excellent example of "national Christianity," such as we shall have when the National Reformers succeed in their efforts. There were present the usual horde of hungry office-seekers in addition to the delegates. According to the published reports, the most of them were distinguished for their ability to swallow champagne. Probably not one in ten of those present ever uttered the name of the Deity except in blasphemy. But this is a "Christian country," therefore the proceedings must be opened each morning by prayer! And so the mob of howling politicians actually quieted down and listened to a prayer? Not much. They cared no more for the prayer than does the average Congress, or State Legislature; and for all the influence Bishop Granberry's prayer had upon the Convention, it might better have been delivered in his closet. His lips were seen to move, by those who took the trouble to look at him, but "his words were heard only by the official stenographer below and the listening angels above." But nevertheless prayer was offered, and so the country is safe, because the Convention was conducted in a Christian manner. *AMS July 1888, page 55.6*

To us such scenes are disgusting and irreverent. But, according to the statements of National Reformers, that is just the thing that they want to have perpetuated. All they want is to fix the Constitution so that there will be no possibility of dispensing with prayer on such occasions as political conventions, possibly so that it will be necessary for the ward caucus to be opened with prayer, and then this will be "in name as well as in fact, a Christian country." Heaven save the mark! What a travesty on Christianity that will be. That friends of the Christian religion should be anxious to see it so trampled in the dust, is almost beyond the possibility of belief. *AMS July 1888, page 55.7*

E. J. Waggoner

The National Prohibition Convention introduced into its platform the same Church and State ideas that the California Prohibition Convention did. The Prohibition party everywhere may now very properly be called the Church and State party.*AMS July 1888, page 56.1*

It is stated that through the efforts of Mrs. Bateham in the unions, over a million signatures have been secured to the petition to Congress asking it to enact a national Sunday law. The Sentinel has not a big list of names to present to Congress, but it can present some facts that are consistent with justice and liberty.*AMS July 1888, page 56.2*

We had a very pleasant talk on National Reform last month, with Prof. J. L. McCartney, of Beaver Falls, Penn., who was visiting in Oakland. The Professor delivered a sermon on National Reform, upon which we made some comments for this number of the Sentinel; but after our review was in type, other matter came in, and it was crowded out. It will appear next month.*AMS July 1888, page 56.3*

In 1829 the United States Senate told the Sunday-law petitioners that they then already enjoyed “all that Christians ought to ask at the hands of any Government-protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments.” This is just as true now as it was then. It is also true of these, and now, as it was of those political bishops of the fourth century, that they seek “not protection for themselves, but power against their opponents.”*AMS July 1888, page 56.4*

According to the speech by Dr. Crafts before the Senate Committee, the churches are going to be content with nothing short of a monopoly of all Sunday action. This, say the leaders, is to protect the workingman from the greed of the grinding monopoly of wealth. But when the churches shall have succeeded in thus protecting him from that monopoly, then we want to know who or what is going to protect us all from the far worse monopoly thus

secured to the churches?*AMS July 1888, page 56.5*

The Chicago *Advance* says that churches and labor organizations East and West are adopting the following resolution:-*AMS July 1888, page 56.6*

“Resolved, That we indorse the petition to Congress, asking it to stop Sunday work in its mail and military service, and in interstate commerce.”*AMS July 1888, page 56.7*

The *Advance* says that the latest indorsements to this resolution are those of “the Central Labor Union and the Carriers’ Association of New York City, the Knights of Labor Council of Chicago and vicinity, the Presbyterian General Assembly, and the State Sunday-school Associations of Missouri and Kansas.” “The Congregational ministers’ meeting of Chicago has recommended that all Congregational Churches take action in this matter either by resolution or petition.” What are the friends of freedom of conscience doing to offset this pressure that is being brought to bear upon Congress? If there are any such who don’t know what to do, we will tell them: Give the American Sentinel a tenfold larger circulation.*AMS July 1888, page 56.8*

Let those who are so zealous to have “the principles of Christianity” taught in the public schools, remember that in many of the public schools in our cities the teachers are Roman Catholics. What kind of Christianity will they teach? Nobody needs to be told that they will teach only the principles of Catholicism. If such a step as is proposed should be taken, thousands of children of Protestants would at once be placed under Roman Catholic instruction. How the Pope must rejoice as he sees professed Protestants playing into his hands!*AMS July 1888, page 56.9*

The Sentinel goes to press as the Republican National Convention is organizing, so we cannot tell how it will treat the various petitions sent to it, but we state as a straw which shows the way the wind blows, the fact that a petition indorsed by the Missouri and Kansas State Sunday-school Conventions, and by thousands of individuals, is in circulation, asking the Republican Convention to insert in its labor blank, a declaration against Sunday labor and trade. The way it is stated is, “against the encroachments upon the workingman’s

Sunday rest by toil or trade.” Notice that it is the Sunday-schools, and not the workingmen, who ask this.*AMS July 1888, page 56.10*

The *Union Signal* says that Rev. W. F. Crafts is working in Chicago in the interest of what is known as the Blair Sunday Bill. It says:-*AMS July 1888, page 56.11*

“He met representatives of the labor organizations, and secured their co-operation in the effort to secure national laws against Sunday mails and Sunday trains. Thus these great organizations in New York City and Chicago are now working unitedly with the W.C.T.U. and the churches to secure a Christian Sabbath.”*AMS July 1888, page 56.12*

But we thought it was only a chance for the workingman to rest, that they want. That’s what they say sometimes; but what they want is the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest and worship. Mr. Crafts secured many hundred signatures to the petitions to Congress.*AMS July 1888, page 56.13*

The *Occident* in noting the Papal rescript against Ireland says:-*AMS July 1888, page 56.14*

“The hope is that a combined effort among the friends of Home Rule may have the decree revoked. But how can an infallible Pope revoke a decree made ex-Cathedra?”*AMS July 1888, page 56.15*

How? Why, easy enough. All that he has to do is to revoke it. That is all. The power to issue contradictory decrees and decisions is the highest, the very crucial, proof of the supreme infallibility of the Pope. That is one of the points in which the Pope is above the Almighty. The Lord, the Creator of heaven and earth, cannot enact contradictory laws, nor issue contradictory decrees, nor render contradictory decisions. His infallibility does not reach so far as that. “He cannot deny himself.” But the Pope can do all these things. He has done them time and again through all the dismal history of the Papal Church, and yet has retained all the infallibility that he ever had, and yet more loudly than ever asserts all the infallibility that he ever claimed. Any sovereign, fallible or infallible, can issue consistent decrees; but no sovereign in Heaven or on earth, except the infallible Pope, can issue inconsistent and contradictory

decrees, and yet remain infallible. That is the supreme test of his supreme infallibility, and, therefore, he is “that man of sin, ...the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped.” *2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4.*AMS July 1888, page 56.16

We heartily welcome to our table the *American Constitutional Vidette*, published monthly by the Mississippi Valley Publishing Company, Beauregard, Miss. We all the more heartily welcome it because it works in the same line as does the American Sentinel-“the defense of the Constitution as it is, and to battle earnestly for civil and religious liberty.” It also is “uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact, let it come from whatever source it may.” Here is our neighbor, we are not a bit jealous; would to God they were all prophets.AMS July 1888, page 56.17

August 1888

“National Reform in the South” American Sentinel 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

In the late National Reform Convention, the reports from the South showed that the South is “solid” for National Reform, as well as in some other respects. One preacher said he had been preaching National Reform principles for twenty years. Another said he thought the South would lead in this “reform,” and “it would be a shame to the South if it did not.” While we are sure that it would be everything else but a shame to her if she did not, we must confess that it would be perfectly in keeping with her efforts on more than one occasion in the past, if she should take a leading part in the National Reform movement. Twenty-seven years ago last spring the South started out in a scheme of “National Reform.” That too was, in a measure, in the direct line of what is now called the National Reform movement. The preamble of the Confederate Constitution, thus ordained and established, reads as follows:-*AMS August 1888, page 57.1*

“We, the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character, in order to form a permanent federal Government, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity-invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God-ordain and establish this Constitution of the Con-federate States of America.”*AMS August 1888, page 57.2*

That so far as it goes is strictly a National Reform Constitution. It contains the name of Almighty God. In it the people invoked “the favor and guidance of Almighty God.” According to National Reform principles that Constitution was “imbued with a divine life,” and the nation confederated under it should have lived forever. But it didn’t live forever worth a cent. Nor will this coming National Reform government live forever any more than that one did.*AMS August 1888, page 57.3*

No, we do not doubt in the least that “the South will lead in this

reform;" it is directly in her line of things.*AMS August 1888, page 57.4*

It is not religion which we oppose but irreligion; we are combatting not Christianity but hypocrisy, for enforced religion is nothing else but enforced hypocrisy.*AMS August 1888, page 57.5*

"A Calm View of National Reform" American Sentinel 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The above heading exactly describes a National Reform sermon to which we listened Sunday forenoon, June 4. The sermon was delivered by Dr. J. L. McCartney, of Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Penn., a man who is a gentleman in every sense of the word, and with whom we formed a very pleasant acquaintance in the few interviews we had with him. We are the more pleased that we had the privilege of listening to his sermon, because, while the Professor is a National Reformer by birth and education, as well as from principle, his presentation of the subject was a calm, dispassionate one, entirely free from that bigoted, boastful spirit so characteristic of those who make them-selves (and National Reform) so conspicuous in the *Christian Statesman*. While Professor McCartney is not a professional exponent of National Reform, he is undoubtedly one of its best representatives.*AMS August 1888, page 57.6*

As a text for his discourse, and the warrant for the National Reform movement in the United States, the Professor read *Deuteronomy 17:18, 19*. That text reads as follows:-*AMS August 1888, page 57.7*

"And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them."*AMS August 1888, page 57.8*

As the reader will at once conclude, these verses are a part of the directions concerning the duty of the king of Israel. But before it can

be decided whether or not they form a warrant for the National Reform movement in this country, we must know something of the context, and accordingly, we quote *verses 14 and 15* of the same chapter:-*AMS August 1888, page 57.9*

“When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.”*AMS August 1888, page 57.10*

The statement, “Thou shalt in any wise set him over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose,” takes the text away from the National Reformers, by showing that there is no analogy between the nation of Israel and the United States of America. That nation was under the direct supervision and leadership of God. It never was a democracy in any sense of the word. The Lord himself selected the family which should furnish the priests; with his own voice he called Moses, who was leader of the people for forty years; and he also designated Joshua as his successor. The people had no voice in the matter. All they had to do was to render obedience to the commands of the leader whom God himself set over them. And so it was through the time of the judges. Although the Lord did not always select the ruler in the same way that he did Moses and Joshua, everybody who is acquainted with Jewish history knows that the people did not choose the one who was to judge them. The case of Gideon is a sample. He had been chosen by the Lord to deliver Israel from their oppressors. When the proper time came, the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he gave the people evidence that he was the one whom God had chosen, and they followed him. When the people became restless, and wanted a king, it was the Lord still who set the king over them. The people had nothing to do with the selection of their ruler. Now, unless the National Reformers are willing to make the claim that this Government should be conducted on the same plan that the Government of Israel was, the people having no voice in the choice of their rulers, they have no right to use the instructions given to Jewish rulers as a guide for the official conduct of the Governors of

States, or the President of the United States*AMS August 1888, page 57.11*

The Government of Israel was a true theocracy; a perfect union of Church and State; the Church and the State were one. National Reformers profess that they want nothing of the kind; we think, indeed, that none of them contemplate giving up the right of franchise, and having the Lord appoint the chief ruler of their country, without the ceremony of conventions and general elections. In fact, it is our firm opinion that the great majority of them would refuse to acknowledge such a ruler as the Lord would select. Then if they do not want such a state of things,-if they really deprecate the idea of Church and State union,-they have no business to quote from the directions given to ancient Israel, as a precedent for their proposed changes in the Government of the United States.*AMS August 1888, page 57.12*

It matters not how much they try to make this Government correspond to that of ancient Israel, they can never make it actually a parallel to that. In that Government God was the actual ruler, he chose that nation out of all the nations of earth, as the depository of his law, designing that it should hold up the standard of divine truth, so that all people who should be inclined to accept the truth might flock to it, and become enrolled among the citizens of Israel. But when the Jews proved recreant to their trust, and, instead of letting the light of truth shine from them to the nations, extinguished that light by their heathenish practices, God cast them off. Since that time he has claimed no special nation as his own. He still has a people called Israel; but they are those in every nation who humbly walk in the way of truth. Their only badge of citizenship is the possession of the Spirit of Christ; and often they are unknown to all except God. Therefore since God has and claims no distinct nation or people as his own, it follows that any attempt to model a Government after that of Israel would be simply to establish a theocracy with human power substituted for that of God. This would be a model, not of ancient Israel, but of the Papacy.*AMS August 1888, page 57.13*

The Professor enumerated various things which he termed the Christian features of our Government. Chief among these were: (1)

The exemption of church property from taxation; (2) the right of Christian ministers to solemnize marriage; (3) the administration of judicial oaths; (4) the appointment of chaplains in the army and navy; (5) the appointment of fast and thanksgiving-days; (6) the use of the Bible in the public schools; and (7) laws concerning a civil Sabbath, and suppressing such things as tend to hinder people in their worship on the first day of the week. In addition to these, he cited the recognition of the Christian religion by the early colonies, and the mention of “the great Governor of the world,” by those who met to ratify the Articles of Confederation. These things, it was claimed, mark this country as a Christian nation, and therefore the organic laws of the nation should contain a declaration of this fact, thus making this a Christian nation in name as well as in fact. The idea that the existence of any or all of these forms makes this a Christian nation,-that we are a Christian nation because the Catholic Church, like some vast railroad corporations, gets along without contributing its share towards the support of the Government; because the clerks in our police courts mumble over oaths to indifferent witnesses who grunt out an assent; because the Government pays certain men a salary to go through, in a perfunctory manner, a form of service every Sunday to men who listen because the regulations require them to,-we say that the idea that any or all of these things make this a Christian nation, is as absurd as was Tertullian’s idea that birds and beasts pray. Said he:-*AMS August 1888, page 58.1*

“Every creature prays; cattle and wild beasts pray and bend the knees; and when they issue from their layers and lairs, they look up heaven-ward with no idle mouth, making their breath vibrate after their own manner. Nay, the birds, too, rising out of the nest, upraise themselves heavenward, and instead of hands, expand the cross of their wings, and say somewhat to seem like prayer.”-*Tertullian on Prayer, chap. 29.AMS August 1888, page 58.2*

If the things that Professor McCartney mentions do or can make this a Christian nation, then we can also adopt Tertullian’s opinion concerning beasts and birds, and we shall have not only a Christian nation, but a Christian universe.*AMS August 1888, page 58.3*

But the Professor complained that there has been, in this country, a

gradual elimination of everything that is Christian. For instance, Thomas Jefferson refused to issue a proclamation for a day of thanksgiving, on the ground that it was unconstitutional. Now, here is a plain question: If Grover Cleveland should neglect or refuse to appoint any thanksgiving-day this year, would the country be any worse off? Would it be any less Christian than it now is? The answer can be nothing else but, No. Will people who live wholly selfish lives, remember their Creator any the more because the President calls upon them to return thanks to him? Not a particle. He cannot make the people one iota more grateful than they would be if he made no thanksgiving proclamation. So far as any practical good is concerned, he might as well call upon everybody to ask a blessing upon every meal they eat. Those who feel thankful will return thanks no matter if a day is not appointed for thanksgiving; and for those who do not feel thankful, to go through the form is mockery. So we think that it is well that it is unconstitutional to appoint thanksgiving-days, and it would be better if our officials would conform to the Constitution in this respect; for them there would be less caricature of sacred things. The day when the Constitution is so changed as to make the requirement of religious forms constitutional, will mark the beginning of an era of national, enforced hypocrisy.*AMS August 1888, page 58.4*

Concerning the exclusion of the Bible from the public schools, Professor McCartney said: "Has it come to this, that the teacher must refrain from telling the child that God made him, and that Christ saves him, lest he should offend to the quick some unbelieving soul?" Well, why shouldn't it come to this? The infidel pays as much money for the support of the school as his believing neighbor does, and therefore has as much right as the other. The Professor would not think of forcing himself into an infidel's house, in order to teach his children concerning Christ. But the school-house is the property of the infidel as much as of the Christian, and his wishes are as much to be respected. It is not a matter of sentiment but of right. To be sure, it is pitiful that children should be allowed to come up ignorant of the great truths of the Bible; but so long as this is a free country, and there are men who are opposed to the Bible, we can't see how it can be avoided. There is ample provision for all who wish to be instructed in the Bible, and to have their children so instructed; and when a man is commissioned to

preach the gospel, he should do so faithfully, no matter whom he offends. But the public school-teacher has no such commission.*AMS August 1888, page 58.5*

It is strange that men will be so blind in regard to this question of the Bible in the public schools. Strange that they cannot see that it must either result in endless controversies, or else to the teaching of the Bible with its truths so emasculated that it will be but hollow mockery. There are a great many different theories held by those who regard the Bible as sacred. The Unitarian would not want his child taught that Christ is God; the Universalist would not want his child taught that they who reject Christ will be doomed to writhe in eternal torment; and there are differences on scores of points among the more orthodox. Of course each individual who clamors for the Bible in the public schools, expects that his particular belief will be taught; he doesn't propose to have his child taught what he regards as heresy. So in order to avoid offense to anybody, the real, vital truths of the Bible will not be taught; and when the Bible is not taught in a way to convert the soul, its teachings amount to nothing. We have too much reverence for the Bible to wish to see it lowered to the standard of a mere text-book, divested of its spiritual power.*AMS August 1888, page 58.6*

The Professor made the usual disclaimer of any intention on the part of National Reformers to unite Church and State. Said he: "Making a religious State does not establish a State religion. There is no proposal to recognize one denomination more than another." Thus they make an arbitrary definition of Church and State union, and then say that they are opposed to that. The Professor's statement is an admission that the recognition of any one denomination by the State would be a union of Church and State. Then will he tell us what name he would give to the recognition of all of them? Surely if one would be a union of Church and State, the other would be seventy and seven fold such a union. Nobody will deny that there was a union of Church and State in all Europe in the Middle Ages. But there was as much difference between the various orders of Catholic monks as there is now among the various denominations of Protestants. Sometimes one order would be specially recognized, and sometimes another, yet Catholicism was all the time supreme. So for this Government to recognize

Christianity in any form, would be just as much a union of Church and State as that was. No matter what form of Christianity is patronized by the State, it will be only a form; the real principle always leaves as soon as the Church coquets with the State.*AMS August 1888, page 58.7*

Here is one of the Professor's significant sentences: "We are the farthest possible from proposing a union of Church and State; and yet, my friends, there are worse things than that." Undoubtedly; but this world has never yet seen a worse thing.*AMS August 1888, page 58.8*

Again, he said that "many good men in Scotland have been tempted to go back from the Free Church into the Established Church, simply because there is so great a tendency toward secularism, and the Established Church stands as a bulwark against infidelity." Why did they ever leave the Established Church? Simply because it was only a religious shell. It was the conservator of a form of religion, but was destitute of converting power. Now, frightened at the flood of iniquity, which the Saviour himself, and also his apostles, said should increase, and imagining that the world must all be "converted," they choose a form of godliness for all, rather than real godliness for a few. In the above statement of the Professor's is seen the real hollowness of the National Reform movement.*AMS August 1888, page 58.9*

The speaker cited the Scripture mottoes which he saw on the drinking fountains in Scotland, the Corn Exchange and other buildings in London, and statues, pictures, etc., in Germany, and said: "All this to me was very beautiful, as indicating the character of those who reigned." "I felt that religion was an element that pervaded society." Perhaps the Professor is more susceptible to religious influences than we are, but we care more for deeds than for words. The actions of those who reign, and of the common people, are to us a better indication of the quality of the religion that pervades society, than any inscriptions can be. We remember that the high priest who sat in judgment on our Saviour, had the name of God bound upon his forehead; and texts of Scripture were worn on the foreheads and forearms of the very men who shouted, "Crucify him." True religion shows itself in something besides inscriptions

and phylacteries. We cannot understand how men so strict personally as the Reformed Presbyterians are, can look with complacency upon a national religion that is only an empty shell. They seem to be infatuated with the name of "national religion." *AMS August 1888, page 59.1*

We can notice only one more statement, and it is a very suggestive one. Speaking of Sunday laws, he remarked that some "complications" have arisen in their enforcement, but that most States have now an exemption clause in favor of those who observe the seventh day. Said he: "There are fears on the part of such [observers of the seventh day] that National Reform may result in persecution. Whatever may be the result, there is nothing further from the hearts of those who are in this movement." We were sorry that he left the matter in this unsettled state. "Whatever may be the result," they do not intend to persecute anybody. We believe that, at least so far as Professor McCartney is concerned; but we would like to have had him tell the people his opinion as to what the result might be. With the disgraceful record of Arkansas and Tennessee so fresh, it is easy to conjecture what the result may be. The Professor doesn't think there will be any persecution, because, as we learned in private conversation, he thinks that those who keep the seventh day will obey Sunday laws out of deference to the majority. The record of the past shows that in this he is mistaken. *AMS August 1888, page 59.2*

We do not see how such men as the Professor can satisfy their conscience by saying that "whatever may be the result," they don't mean to harm anybody, when they must know, and do know, that the success of their movement can result in nothing else but persecution to dissenters. Here is the picture: A boy is standing on the top of a cliff, with a huge rock just balanced on the edge; below there are a great many people; just before he gives the rock a shove, he calls out: "You folks down there seem to be greatly afraid that this rock will hurt some of you; but I want you to understand that whatever the result may be, I have no evil designs toward any of you; I am going to roll this rock down the cliff merely to gratify myself, and not for the purpose of injuring you; it won't hurt you unless you happen to be in its way." Very consoling isn't it? Cannot our friends, the National Reformers, see themselves somewhere in

the above picture? E.J.W.*AMS August 1888, page 59.3*

“Let There Be No Alliance with Rome” American Sentinel 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The Presbyterian Union of New York City is composed of the Presbyterian ministers of that city. In their meeting February 28, the discussion turned on the question, “How far is the Roman Catholic Church our ally, and how far our enemy?” From a report of the proceedings we take the following points of interest:-*AMS August 1888, page 61.1*

Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., the ecclesiastical historian and professor in Union Theological Seminary, opened the discussion. He said that the origin of the Roman Catholic Church was involved in obscurity. It may have originated on the day of pentecost; it may have originated at Corinth, or it may have originated much later. In any event the precise time could not be fixed. He claimed that the Pope, but not the church, is antichrist. That the Pope and the church are not one, and that Second Thessalonians refers to the Pope alone, claiming that this was the view held by Calvin, Melancthon, and Luther. He said that the Roman Catholic Church must hold to all the cardinal doctrines, such as the Trinity, divinity of Christ, justification, sanctification, good works, and others. He emphasized the historic character of the church and that under its claim of infallibility it could not abandon one of the cardinal doctrines and live; that it was the largest church of Christendom, with its 200,000,000 members, and should be the ally of Protestantism.*AMS August 1888, page 61.2*

Rev. Dr. John Hall, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, was the next speaker. Each point that Dr. Schaff raised Dr. Hall answered, and when he said that he could not realize how so learned a man, a professor in the chair of church history in a Presbyterian theological seminary, could advocate an alliance with the historic enemy of truth, justice, and morality, he was enthusiastically applauded.*AMS August 1888, page 62.1*

He held to his clear and logical style of argumentation, but his deep interest and earnest convictions upon this important subject, led him

into such bursts of eloquence that he carried his audience before him with irresistible force.*AMS August 1888, page 62.2*

Dr. Hall said that he had lived among Catholics; had preached in a parish where there were three Roman Catholics to one Protestant; he had been to Rome and met the cardinals, to whom he had been introduced. He knew Romanists and Romanism, priesthood and laity, better, probably, than any person present. He said the Pope was the church and the church was the Pope, and that both are antichrist, "so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The Pope and Romanism stand and fall together. Paul denounced this antichrist, this son of perdition, as the workman of Satan; that Satan who had overcome the first Adam, and with all the subtlety of his nature endeavored to overcome the second Adam, but had failed. Satan had endeavored to overcome Christ by offers of that temporal power which the Church of Rome now holds out, and the offer was made by the same arch conspirator.*AMS August 1888, page 62.3*

Moses's fight was continually against apostasy. Satan does not ask the people at first to become atheists, but he asks them to place alongside of the true God other gods also. This is what the Roman Catholic Church asks and does. Satan was satisfied when the Jewish kings set up the temple of the living God, provided they had Baal and Ashtaroth in their groves. As to the origin of the Roman Church, a careful reading of history showed that it was from Constantine, who was a shrewd statesman, a politician and murderer, that it had sprung. Out of heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity, were taken those portions of their several services that would appeal to the sensualism of man, and with these playing upon the inborn sentiment of natural religion, Christ was kept out of the heart.*AMS August 1888, page 62.4*

Dr. Schaff had referred to the decrees of the Council of Trent, acknowledging the divinity, kingship, and priestly offices of Christ. Dr. Hall said that it was true, but it was not fair to quote a portion and not the whole of the decrees. Read them through and in their logical connection, and you would find that they were completely Romish; the doctrine of justification is ignored, Christ's office as a Saviour is rendered wholly void; and every leading doctrine of the

religion of Christ had been manipulated until it was of none effect.*AMS August 1888, page 62.5*

The decrees of the Council of Trent claimed ten virtues for the priesthood, traditions, penances, purgatory, indulgences, and in Mariolatry, to one in the atonement of Christ. Christ's divinity was merged in the infallibility of the Pope, the influence of the Holy Ghost merged in the confessional interferences of the priesthood, and instead of bowing to the kingship of Christ, the devotees of the Roman system kissed the toe of St. Peter's statue. No Catholic is permitted by the decrees of the church to be "justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," and his soul goes blindly into purgatory in order that the church may receive money for saying masses for his soul.*AMS August 1888, page 62.6*

As to the church's influence, no devotee of heathenism in Japan but lives a freer life than does the slave of Romanism. There is no truth of the decalogue that it has not broken, no truth of Christianity that it has not assailed.*AMS August 1888, page 62.7*

It is claimed that the marriage relationship has been defended by the Romish Church, and yet there has been no greater insult offered to that holy relationship than celibacy and monasticism and their attendant evils.*AMS August 1888, page 62.8*

It is said that Romanism educates. It does so in places where it has no other way to carry on its aggressive work, and when it does educate, it does so always at your expense; but where it can get along without it, it does not educate.*AMS August 1888, page 62.9*

It is claimed that the Roman Church holds in check the turbulent spirits that have caused our strikes, and that we should join hands with it to keep this power under restraint. That 60,000,000 of people should conciliate 8,000,000 of enemies to their liberties in order to keep in check a small portion of our body politic! No; a thousand times better that these misguided people should strike, and strike, until they learn how to appreciate the laws of our land and their own good, rather than that the iron band of superstition and spiritual death should be riveted about their arms and souls until they could not move.*AMS August 1888, page 62.10*

The Presbyterian Church should not form such an unholy alliance. It was our duty to magnify Protestantism, the Christianity of the Bible, and not make an unholy alliance with error. He had no word against the individuals of the Church of Rome, but against that church he should always raise his voice.*AMS August 1888, page 62.11*

When Dr. Hall had concluded, the Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D., pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church, arose and commenced his address with the question, "Why should we not join with the Roman Catholic Church in the fight against infidelity?" He paused and deliberately said, "Because the Roman Catholic Church makes infidelity." The answer was electrical. The audience cheered and applauded for several minutes. Dr. Crosby continued: "The Roman Catholic Church has been called an historic church, and we are asked to make it an ally because it is such. Look at Mohammedism, Buddhism; they, too, are historic. Shall we join with them on account of their antiquity?"*AMS August 1888, page 62.12*

"When does an apple get so rotten that it ceases to be an apple?" said the doctor. "Let us not be deceived by the virtues of those who are superior to their religion, into fellowship with that which is unfriendly to our every interest."*AMS August 1888, page 62.13*

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The Pope has secured a convention with the Government of Colombia, South America, by which there is secured to the Papacy the protection of Catholicism as the State religion, the exemption of religious buildings from taxation, and the exemption of the clergy from military service. The clergy will have entire control of the Government schools and universities.*AMS August 1888, page 64.1*

The Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D.D., is a man of such standing that he can be allowed to say with freedom what would be called rank heresy in others. Speaking of the votes which were cast for Miss Willard, in the Methodist General Conference, as editor of the New York *Christian Advocate*, he said in the New York Evangelist of June 14:-*AMS August 1888, page 64.2*

“Miss Willard is a lady of rare gifts and graces, yet she is in danger of exchanging her lofty position as a Christian philanthropist, for that of a political wire-puller. Woman in yonder missionary meetings is beautiful; but woman in a political caucus or committee, is hardly an object for angels to admire.”*AMS August 1888, page 64.3*

To all of which we heartily say, Amen.*AMS August 1888, page 64.4*

We are opposed to the so-called National Reform movement, not because if it succeeds our position as dissenters might be made uncomfortable, but because it is in no sense a reform. It is a step backward, and a long step too. It is a return to the policy of the Dark Ages—a substitution of the shell of Christianity for the kernel. Some may think that it is better to have even the *form* of Christianity without the substance, if we cannot have the reality; but we do not think so. Empty shells are of no earthly use except to take up valuable room. And so the empty shell of Christianity, which “National Reform” would give us, would serve simply to crowd out vital Christianity. As Christians we are opposed to the National Reform movement; and everyone who loves real, vital Christianity ought to be arrayed against it.*AMS August 1888, page 64.5*

The *Christian Statesman* of June 28 has an editorial strongly condemning the late National Republican Convention for its “lack of Christian character and purpose,” which closes with the following words:—*AMS August 1888, page 64.6*

“The convention illustrates accurately the irreligious character of our political system, in which infidels like Ingersoll, and Presbyterian elders like Harrison, of Indiana, sit together in the same councils, having agreed beforehand that differences in religion shall be no hindrance to their fellowship.”*AMS August 1888, page 64.7*

Well, why should differences in religion be a hindrance to their fellowship in civil and political councils? Is not the proper administration of government of just as much importance to an infidel as it is to a Presbyterian elder? Are not an infidel’s rights just the same, and just as sacred, under civil government as are those of a Presbyterian elder, or anybody else, and *vice versa*? If not, why not? Is it not the truth that “all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among

which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”? And is it not to secure these ends that Governments are instituted among men? Every person who has any regard for the Declaration of Independence must answer, Yes. Well, then, again we ask, Why should differences in religion be any hindrance to their fellowship in securing to themselves life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? But such a political system doesn’t suit the *Christian Statesman* at all. It wants a political system established in which agreement in religion shall be the sole basis of civil fellowship; a political system in which every citizen’s religion shall be put to the test in every campaign. And that will be but the Papacy over again.*AMS August 1888, page 64.8*

“A Congressman’s Opinion” American Sentinel 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent of the Sentinel, in Washington City, obtained an interview with Congressman Mason, of Illinois, and sent us the following report. It reached us in June but too late for publication in the July Sentinel. We gladly give it place. Its points are well taken. Mr. Mason said:-*AMS August 1888, page 64.9*

“The bill is remarkable in many ways, and I cannot now, for want of time, discuss the same as fully as I would like. But I am surprised that a man of Mr. Blair’s opportunities should wholly ignore a class of citizens who worship on the seventh day instead of on Sunday. In the first place, the constitutional right to worship would be imposed, in my opinion, by this bill. And to say that a person who keeps Saturday instead of Sunday shall not be allowed to work on any other particular day of the week, is, in my opinion, a deprivation of the rights of property, and a substantial violation of that part of the Constitution which says that a citizen shall not be deprived of his life, liberty or property, without due process of law.”*AMS August 1888, page 64.10*

It is simply childish for Senator Blair to provide that such a citizen may not do any work on Sunday “to the disturbance of others.” He knows if he is familiar with history, and knows anything about the natural bent of the human mind, that any labor, however simple, or

however retired, would be “to the disturbance of others,” if the “others” were strongly of the belief, as many are, that Sunday should be a legal day of rest.*AMS August 1888, page 64.11*

There are people in this world who are “disturbed” if your dress does not suit them, and the Senator might as well prescribe the fashion to dress as to say that those who worship on Saturday *shall* worship on Sunday.*AMS August 1888, page 64.12*

I wish to be understood as saying that I do not believe in disturbance of public or private worship on Sunday or Saturday, but what I wish to say is that this bill or any bill seeking to fix a day of worship, by law, against the conscience or judgment of a large class of our citizens, is thoroughly unconstitutional, un-American, and, in my humble judgment, un-Christian.*AMS August 1888, page 64.13*

I am informed that under State Sunday laws, members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and the Seventh-day Baptist Church, have been tried and convicted for performing their ordinary duties in a peaceful way, on Sunday, after having observed Saturday as their day of worship, and those persons have been committed to prisons.*AMS August 1888, page 64.14*

Such action is certainly unconstitutional. Suppose for instance, the Sunday Bill is passed, and, in 1889, two-thirds are converted to the belief that we should worship on the seventh day. Then the law would be changed to fit the demands of the majority-religious liberty becomes a political foot-ball-the Church and State would be united, and the most sacred article of our Constitution, which protects the inherent rights of the minority, would be destroyed.*AMS August 1888, page 64.15*

The *Interior* says:-*AMS August 1888, page 64.16*

“When George Washington was presented with his little hatchet, his fingers ached to cut something with it. It is admitted that George was a good little boy, and meant no harm by chop-ping down the cherry tree. It has been so ever since. When power is put into an American *parvenu*’s hands-and we are all parvenus in this country, more or less-his fingers burn to exercise it, and if there is no useful

work in sight he is sure to do mischief-and is very liable to anyway. If he has the self-confidence of combined egotism and inexperience, he is irrepressible in his ugliness of purpose.”*AMS August 1888, page 64.17*

This is just the position we take with reference to the National Reformers. There are very many good people among them. There are many well-meaning persons who are anxious to see laws enacted for the better observance of Sunday. They say that they do not wish to infringe in the least upon the rights of others. But they don't know what they would do if they had the power. As the boy who has a brand new, sharp knife, cannot rest content until he has tried its edge, so the man who comes into the possession of power to which he is unaccustomed, must needs test his new thy to see how it works. He may not mean any harm, but power is a very dangerous tool in the hands of an inexperienced person. If you would have religious liberty, keep out of the hands of even the best of men every semblance of power to persecute for conscience' sake.*AMS August 1888, page 64.18*

September 1888

“Civil Sabbath” American Sentinel 3, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* has sent us a circular giving reasons why that paper is to be commended. One of these reasons is:-*AMS September 1888, page 66.1*

“Because it advocates a civil as well as a church Sabbath.”*AMS September 1888, page 66.2*

But there is no such thing as a civil Sabbath. The original, supreme, and only Sabbath law-the fourth commandment-says explicitly of the Sabbath, that it is “the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” It is not the Sabbath of any civil government, it is the Sabbath of the Lord. He calls it, “My holy day.” Christ has commanded us to render to God that which is God’s, while we render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar’s. The Sabbath being the Lord’s day, it is to be rendered to him and not to Cæsar. Civil government can never of right have anything to do with directing the observance of the Sabbath. Whenever it undertakes to do so, it puts itself in the place of God, and usurps the authority of God, both in such legislation, and by invading the sacred precincts of the conscience. The Lord alone “is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to stand between God and the conscience. A violation of this divine law written in the heart is an assault upon the majesty of God and the image of God in man.”*AMS September 1888, page 66.3*

“Bad Institutions and Good Men” American Sentinel 3, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

The American Sentinel has often called attention to the rapid spread of National Reform ideas, while the great majority of those who love real liberty seem to be asleep. The National Reform Association itself is a comparatively insignificant affair, and if the issue depended on its efforts alone, there would not be much to fear. Its organs, the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation*,

have long ago ceased to publish distinctively National Reform articles, and seem to exist chiefly in order that the association's "secretaries," who sacrifice themselves in the cause of reform for one hundred dollars a month and expenses, may have a place in which to tell of their exploits. But the success of that which is misnamed National Reform does not depend on their efforts. There is just one thing that this so-called National Reform really stands for, and that is the passage and enforcement of strict Sunday laws, and for this many are working who are not known as National Reformers.*AMS September 1888, page 68.1*

As an example of how the great object of the National Reform Association is gaining ground, take the Blair Sunday Bill. By request of certain influential persons in the church, Senator Blair introduced the bill, and it passed its second reading in the Senate almost before it had been heard of by anybody outside of the "ring" which had started it. Then the Rev. Dr. Crafts devoted his whole attention to it, and has already succeeded in working up large petitions in favor of it. He has got the churches, the Sunday-school Associations, and many trades-unions and Knights of Labor clubs to take hold of the matter, so that when the bill comes to its final passage, the legislators will be confronted with documents setting forth that the people of the country are almost unanimous in desiring the measure.*AMS September 1888, page 68.2*

But besides all this, there is the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which is now married, as the *Statesman* claims, to the National Reform Association. A more correct statement would be that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has adopted the National Reform Association, and is nursing its principles into stalwart proportions. Whichever way it is put, however, the fact remains that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with its vast influence, is wholly committed to the principles of the National Reform Association, and 1892 is set as the date for its triumph. Judging from the vast host of names of men and women both dead and alive that are arrayed in favor of the movement, we cannot see much presumption in the claim that it will succeed in four years. Think of it, you who have recently celebrated another anniversary of our country's independence, and are swelling with pride at the thought that this is the freest country on earth-only four

years to elapse before liberty in this country will be dead! only four years until laws shall be passed which will inaugurate a system of espionage upon those who think differently from the majority, and who have the courage of their convictions, which will be worse than any that ever existed in Russia! Is it a pleasant prospect? If not, what are you going to do about it? Do you say that if it is going to come it will come, and that you will not let it swerve you from the right when it does come? That will not do; for if through your indifference any who might have been warned of the danger, and put on their guard, are taken unawares and overcome by the speciousness or the force of the oppressor, their blood will be upon your head. It is time for somebody to be awake, for there is just before us a struggle between right and wrong such as the world has never yet seen. It will be a struggle between error entrenched in law, and having the cloak of righteousness, and truth under ban of law, and covered with reproach and stigmatized as blasphemy. He who stands firm for truth at that time will need much of the grace of God. There will yet be greater need for the martyr spirit than ever before in the history of the world.*AMS September 1888, page 68.3*

Right here, however, we are met with the charge of inconsistency. "How can it be possible," it is asked, "that such evils should result from a movement that is in the hands of so many good people." Our friends of the opposition tell us that the very arguments which we bring forward to show the strength of the National Reform movement, are strong arguments to show its righteousness. Indeed, it often puzzles many people who are really opposed to the principles of the association, to know how any harm can come from anything which is introduced by the good folks of the churches and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We will explain by a brief reference to the history of the past. And we will quote, first, as a text, a passage from the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, of May, 1844, written by Rev. Ralph Emerson, D.D., at that time Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary. It is this: —*AMS September 1888, page 68.4*

"Few things can be so pernicious to the church as a general belief that no very bad measure was ever introduced by good men or with a great and good purpose. Then will they look at the character of the men, and at the object proposed, instead of scrutinizing the

means by which it is to be effected; and the work is done before its character is suspected. Nearly all the bad institutions in the church-Jesuitism among the rest-have been by apparently good men, and for a professedly good purpose.”*AMS September 1888, page 68.5*

This is a point that is given too little attention. When we portray the essential wickedness of the National Reform movement, we do not impugn the character nor the motives of its abettors. We are convinced that many of them are conscientious men; but we never yet saw a good man who could not make a mistake, nor one whose advocacy of a bad institution could make that institution good.*AMS September 1888, page 68.6*

We will take, for example, the system of slavery as it existed years ago in this country. That it was a wicked institution few will now have the hardihood to deny. Even the people where it flourished, and who reaped all the benefit that was to be reaped from it, are glad that it is abolished. And yet thousands of good men upheld the institution, and held slaves. It cannot be denied that there were people who held slaves, who were personally as upright, and as conscientious Christians, as any who opposed the institution. It is no doubt true that very many slaves were actually in better circumstances than many colored people are now in a state of freedom. But these are not the things by which we judge slavery. Even if the vast majority of slave-holders had been humane men, that would not have made the system right. The fact is that under that system which was upheld by so many good men, a bad man could expend upon his slaves all the hellish brutality of his nature, and the law would uphold him in it. The principle of the system was, in the first place, opposed to the golden rule, and all the good men in the world could not, by their advocacy of it, make it right. The system must be judged by the injustice which it allowed men to do.*AMS September 1888, page 68.7*

So must we judge of the National Reform system. When a universal rigid Sunday law is once passed, all the good intentions of the men who are working to secure it, and the humane feelings of the good women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, cannot prevent the law from being used as an instrument of cruelty upon persons who conscientiously differ with the majority.*AMS*

The methods which are used to advance the movement should convince anybody that there is something essentially wrong about it. We have already spoken of the great lists of names which Rev. Mr. Crafts is securing to petitions in favor of the Blair Sunday Bill. But it would take too long, and would involve too much labor, to circulate these petitions throughout all the country, for individual signatures. So a scheme has been devised by which a great deal more influence can be secured for it, with much less trouble. The matter is to be presented, not to individuals, but to churches, and a vote taken on it. If the vote is favorable, as it will usually be, then the entire membership of the church will be counted as favorable. Let us illustrate. Here is a church of five hundred members. At one of its meetings, when there is an average attendance of perhaps three hundred members, a vote is taken on the Sunday bill, and no one votes against it. Then by the vote of less than three hundred people, the influence of five hundred is secured in favor of the bill, although many of the five hundred may be opposed to the bill. Even though a few of the three hundred present vote against the bill, their votes are not counted out, and so opposition is by this legerdemain turned into advocacy. Anything which uses such methods must be inherently wrong.*AMS September 1888, page 69.2*

Before we close we must refer to a little circumstance that happened years ago, for the express benefit of those who think that no harm can come from a movement that is in the hands of such good women as the leaders of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Some men named Paul and Barnabas were preaching the doctrines of a sect that was everywhere spoken against. They were doing this, notwithstanding the fact that their preaching had been condemned by the established church, and was utterly out of harmony with the belief of the majority of church members. At Antioch, in Pisidia, they had been so active that "the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region," much to the disgust of the general public. So the record says:-*AMS September 1888, page 69.3*

"But the Jews stirred up the devout and honorable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and

Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts." *Acts 13:50.AMS September 1888, page 69.4*

Here is something for our friends to consider. If it had not been for the influence of the "devout and honorable women," Paul and Barnabas might have continued preaching in Antioch. The heathen did not persecute them, but on the contrary rejoiced to hear the word; it was the good people of the church, "the chief men of the city," and the "devout and honorable women,"-the eminently respectable and moral people,-that persecuted Paul and Barnabas, and drove them from the country. And who shall say that a similar thing may not happen again? We bring no charges against the worthy women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We are willing to grant that they are all "devout and honorable," but we remember that just such women once persecuted the preachers of the gospel, and were no less "devout and honorable" when they got through than when they begun. When error is upheld by law, then the law-abiding people must prosecute those who stand for truth and against error; and in such a case prosecution becomes persecution.*AMS September 1888, page 69.5*

E.J.W.

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

Doctor Crafts reports that between three and four million names have already been secured to the petitions in behalf of the National Sunday law.*AMS September 1888, page 72.1*

The names of seventeen hundred new sub-scribers have been added to the Sentinel list within the last thirty days. The reason of existence of the Sentinel is becoming every day more and more a living issue, and we are glad to know that the Sentinel grows in favor with the people accordingly.*AMS September 1888, page 72.2*

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizers have ceased to organize

local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas. So says District Secretary M.A. Gault in the American, June 27, 1888.*AMS September 1888, page 72.3*

Thousands of people are signing petitions for the National Sunday law, without a thought of harm to themselves or anybody else. Yet only harm to thousands of people can ever come from the enactment of such a law. Many of those who are signing the petitions would not do so if they knew the danger that there is in the enactment of the law. The Sentinel clearly points out the danger. Therefore the Sentinel should be placed in the hands of every person in the land. Are you doing your part to see that this shall be done?*AMS September 1888, page 72.4*

The *Christian at Work* says:-*AMS September 1888, page 72.5*

"The Spanish Constitution guarantees equal religious liberty to all. But that did not prevent two Protestant citizens of Madrid from being arrested, tried, and condemned, the other day, to six months' imprisonment for refusing to kneel before the Viaticum. We do not know if the offenders were Englishmen or Americans, or of what nationality-perhaps they were Spaniards. But some action should be taken that will secure to Protestants in Spain their just constitutional rights. They must spell liberty in a queer way in the Andalusian country."*AMS September 1888, page 72.6*

Oh, no, they don't! They spell it just as it is spelled in New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, and just as they are fast learning to spell it all over this country. Spain has a national religion; it is Catholicism; and refusing to kneel before the Viaticum "disturbs" the devotees of the national religion. Such "disturbance" must not be allowed, hence these prosecutions; precisely as the New York law punishes those who "disturb" the Sunday worshipers by working on Sunday, and as Senator Blair's proposed Sunday law will punish men all over the country. The American method of spelling liberty has descended almost to a level with the Andalusian.*AMS September 1888, page 72.7*

Communications have been addressed to the Sentinel asking its influence in favor of a certain party or candidate. We have but one

reply that we can make to all communications of this kind, viz.: The Sentinel cannot lend its influence to any party or candidate as such. The Sentinel is not in politics in that sense. It is not partisan in any sense. The Sentinel is devoted to the defense of the National Constitution as it is, so far as religion is concerned; and in this is devoted to the defense of the civil and religious rights and liberties of every person in the nation, regardless of party or creed. And now that the National Constitution is attacked at this very point, and by a United States Senator at that, this question ought to take precedence of every other in National affairs. With the Sentinel this question does take precedence of everything else, therefore the Sentinel cannot be partisan in any sense.*AMS September 1888, page 72.8*

The latter part of July, "Sam" Jones, the great revivalist, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans, who went over there to hear him. One of his devout, elegantly refined, and intensely instructive passages was this:-*AMS September 1888, page 72.9*

"Now I'll tell you, I think we are running the last political combat on the lines we have been running them on. It is between the Republicans And Democrats, this contest, and it is the last the Republicans will make in America. The Democrats are going in overwhelmingly. Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, Heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on."*AMS September 1888, page 72.10*

And this the Christian Statesman inserts under the heading, "The National Reform Movement!" It is very appropriately placed. It is a worthy addition to the literature of the National Reform movement. But what consummate mountebanks many of those popular "revivalists" do make of themselves!*AMS September 1888, page 72.11*

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 9, Rev. R. C. Wylie praises Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment, because it

would, if adopted, give the National Reformers many ad-vantages which they have not now. He says:-*AMS September 1888, page 72.12*

"We would then have a vantage-ground we have not now. The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection, which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us."*AMS September 1888, page 72.13*

That is to say: The charge of invading the rights of conscience has, so far, lain against the National Reformers; but now, if this amendment is carried, this charge will lie against the amendment, and will spend itself there, while the National Reformers escape. This charge is justly made against the National Reformers; for they distinctly affirm that the civil power has the right to compel the consciences of men. And the admission that if the amendment were adopted the charge would then lie against that, is a confession that the proposed amendment, if adopted, will invade the rights of conscience. And that is the truth. It will surely do so. If it would not, it would not be so heartily indorsed by the National Reformers.*AMS September 1888, page 72.14*

Rev. R. C. Wylie says the National Reformers should advocate Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution,*AMS September 1888, page 72.15*

"Because of the aid it will give us in discussing National Reform principles. Some of these are clearly embodied in the amendment. Senator Blair's amendment marks an epoch in our history... The pulpit and the platform should herald the truths it teaches, from ocean to ocean."*AMS September 1888, page 72.16*

Yes, the amendment will not only aid in discussing National Reform principles, it will also, if adopted, most materially aid the National Reformers in carrying those principles into practice by the civil power, and in satisfying their in-tense longing to tolerate dissenters as lunatics and conspirators are tolerated.*AMS September 1888, page 72.17*

As was to be expected, the National Reformers are delighted with Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution. It is in substance just what they have been working for all these years. The *Christian Statesman* of July 12 says the amendment "should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians." In its issue of July 19 the *Statesman* says:-*AMS September 1888, page 72.18*

"Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people."*AMS September 1888, page 72.19*

Then, after mentioning "Christianity, the religion of the Nation," and "The Bible, the textbook of our common Christianity, in all the schools," it says:-*AMS September 1888, page 72.20*

"These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?"*AMS September 1888, page 72.21*

We are afraid that the iniquitous scheme will actually carry.*AMS September 1888, page 72.22*

October 1888

“Front Page” American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Thousands of people are signing petitions for the National Sunday law, without a thought of harm to themselves or anybody else. Yet only harm to thousands of people can ever come from the enactment of such a law. Many of those who are signing the petitions would not do so if they knew the danger that there is in the enactment of the law. The Sentinel clearly points out the danger. Therefore the Sentinel should be placed in the hands of every person in the land. Are you doing your part to see that this shall be done?*AMS October 1888, page 73.1*

Not long since a Prohibition Convention was held in Visalia, Cal. The preachers were very active and enthusiastic in it; and they succeeded in arousing a good deal of enthusiasm in the body of the convention. After the convention had dispersed the following question was put to two of the preachers: “I suppose the object of this is, in the long run, to work it into a Sunday law?” And the answer was this:-*AMS October 1888, page 73.2*

“That is what it is; but we are not saying anything about that now, till we get the thing in running order-then we will bring that in.” That is precisely the scheme which the preachers are working through the third-party-Prohibition movement, and that is just the way that they are working it. Under cover of Prohibition and temperance legislation they are working for the establishment of a religious despotism.*AMS October 1888, page 73.3*

Recently a preacher in Selma, Cal., delivered a sermon in which he said:-*AMS October 1888, page 73.4*

“We have laws to punish the man who steals our property; but we have no law to prevent people from working on Sunday. It is right that the thief be punished; but I have more sympathy for that man than I have for him that works on that day.”*AMS October 1888, page 73.5*

This is directly in the line of things promised by the Prohibition party. Whenever any party sets itself up as the protector of the Lord, and legislates upon things pertaining to God, then offenses, or supposed offenses, against God take precedence of all things else. Heresy becomes the highest crime. Then the thief will be let run, and receive sympathy, while the man who quietly works at his lawful and honest calling is prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned. And Senator Blair's proposed amendment and Sunday law open the way for such men as this to carry their views into effect, by the civil power.*AMS October 1888, page 73.6*

"The National Sunday Bill" American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The National Sunday Bill, introduced into the United States Senate by Senator Blair, is a queer piece of legislation for this enlightened age and country, in more senses than one. We have referred to it in our columns before; but as the legislation itself is the first step taken in an endless controversy, this is ample excuse for referring to it again. But besides this there is sufficient material in the bill itself to justify a long discussion, and even continuous repetition, until the people shall see the danger there is threatening their cherished liberties and dearest rights.*AMS October 1888, page 73.7*

We propose to notice it section by section, and call attention, briefly, to some of the moral and civil delinquencies that show themselves in the bill.*AMS October 1888, page 73.8*

The first section embodies legislation in regard to "the Lord's day," and is as follows:-*AMS October 1888, page 73.9*

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known

as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section." *AMS October 1888, page 73.10*

This is contrary to the word of Christ. Christ said: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." By these words it is clear that that which is the Lord's is not to be rendered to Cæsar, but to the Lord. Cæsar is civil government; therefore, we are not to render to civil government that which is the Lord's; with what is the Lord's Cæsar has nothing to do. Senator Blair's bill, in legislating upon that which pertains to the Lord, plainly sets itself against the word of Christ, and is, therefore, antichristian. *AMS October 1888, page 73.11*

Again, this section declares that no person shall do any work, "nor engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." This leaves it entirely with the other man, or with judge or jury, to say whether that which has been done was a disturbance; and that is only to make every man's action on Sunday subject to the whim or caprice of his neighbor. But "any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror, savors of tyranny." The doctrine embodied in this section of the Blair bill is subversive of liberty. It attacks; not only the inherent rights, but the constitutional rights, of every American citizen. For a sound judicial decision upon this principle of this section see the article entitled, "The Savor of Tyranny," in another column of this paper. *AMS October 1888, page 73.12*

Section two is as follows:- *AMS October 1888, page 73.13*

"Sec. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated

upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.”*AMS October 1888, page 73.14*

The object of this section is to stop the carrying of the mails on Sunday; but yet any letter that relates to a work of necessity or mercy, or the health, life, or death of any person, which has the fact plainly stated upon the face of the envelope, shall be delivered on the first day of the week.*AMS October 1888, page 73.15*

Section 3 is as follows:-*AMS October 1888, page 73.16*

“Sec. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.”*AMS October 1888, page 73.17*

This section embodies the same principle as the first in regard to the disturbance of others, and sets a heavy penalty upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality. Upon what principle

except that of religious intolerance can it ever be made to appear that an act which is not only perfectly innocent but entirely laudable when performed on any other day of the week, becomes so intensely criminal when performed on the first day of the week as to deserve a penalty of a thousand dollars fine?*AMS October 1888, page 73.18*

Section 4 reads:-*AMS October 1888, page 74.1*

"Sec. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day."*AMS October 1888, page 74.2*

So far as anything in this section is in itself concerned there is nothing particularly to be noticed except that it is directly in the line of Constantine's Sunday legislation. He, however, went a step further and caused his soldiers to parade expressly for worship, and wrote out a prayer which he had them all repeat at a given signal. Something like this may fairly be expected to follow should this bill become a law; because, as religious observance and religious worship are the objects of the bill, why should not the soldiers be required to pray on Sunday as well as to religiously observe the day? It may be said that the *religious* observance of the day is not required; but when we come to section six, it will be seen that it is.*AMS October 1888, page 74.3*

Section 5 reads thus:-*AMS October 1888, page 74.4*

"Sec. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same."*AMS October 1888, page 74.5*

This section provides that if any person works for any other person on Sunday, and receives payment for it at any time, then any person in the wide world, except the parties concerned, can enter suit, and recover the money so paid. If you work for me on Sunday, and I ever pay you for it, then the first man that finds it out can sue you and get the money. That is what the bill says. The bill says that when wages are paid for Sunday work, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same. "Whoever," is a universal term. Therefore, this bill deliberately proposes that when any man who is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, receives payment for work done on Sunday, except of necessity or mercy, he may be sued for that money by whoever first learns that he has received it, and that person shall get the money.*AMS October 1888, page 74.6*

To think that any such legislation as is embodied in this section should ever be thought of by any sane person, is sufficiently astonishing; but that it should not only have been thought of, but should have been thought of and embodied in a bill, and introduced into the United States Senate by a United States Senator, and that it should have passed two readings in that body without a dissenting voice, is simply astounding. It almost surpasses belief. But here are the facts which demonstrate that such things have been done in this land of liberty, in the National Legislature, in this year of the nineteenth century. When United States Senators will employ their time in such legislation as that, then whose liberties are safe? Senator Blair is a Prohibitionist of National reputation. He may justly be considered a representative Prohibitionist, and the legislation proposed in this bill, and in this section of the bill, may justly be considered a representative piece of Prohibitionist legislation.*AMS October 1888, page 74.7*

But if that be so, then the fewer Prohibitionists who ever, as such, secure legislative power, the better will it be for the people. And when such legislation as is here proposed can be introduced, and read twice in the United States Senate, without a dissenting voice, then it is high time that the American people were awaking to that eternal vigilance which only is the price of liberty.*AMS October 1888, page 74.8*

The last section of the bill is as follows:-*AMS October 1888, page 74.9*

“Sec. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.”*AMS October 1888, page 74.10*

This section is simply provisory, and requires no comment, except the last few lines, which show the object of the entire bill; and that is, “to secure to the whole people rest, ...and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.” No one, therefore, need attempt to evade the force of objections against this bill by saying that it is not the religious, but the *civil*, observance of the day that is required; because here it is plainly declared in the bill itself, that it is not only to secure rest to all the people, but that it is also to secure the *religious* observance of the Sabbath day. There is not a single reference in the bill to any such thing as the civil observance of the day. The word “civil” is not used in the bill. It is a religious bill wholly. The first section defines the Lord’s day; the second section refers to the day as one of worship and rest; section three refers to it as a day of religious worship; section four refers to its observance as that of religious worship; and section six plainly declares what is apparent throughout, that the object of the whole bill is “to secure to the whole people rest *and religious* observance of the Sabbath day,” on the first day of the week.*AMS October 1888, page 74.11*

It is religious legislation, and that only; but as the present Constitution forbids religious legislation, it was necessary to follow the presentation of this bill by a proposed amendment to the

Constitution establishing the Christian religion. Thus the two go hand in hand. They belong together; either necessitates the other. Let either be adopted, and in the language of the United States Senate in 1829, it will "involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society, or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced it will be impossible to define its bounds... If admitted it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it, and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences... If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts we must pursue it to its *ultimatum*... Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World." *AMS October 1888, page 74.12*

The Blair Sunday Bill and its accompanying constitutional amendment bear in them, or in either of them, this desolating scourge, and if adopted will spread that scourge over all this fair land. Therefore we are eternally opposed to this bill or anything like it. We oppose it as human beings who have respect for human rights; we oppose it as American citizens who believe in the rights and liberties asserted for mankind by the Declaration of Independence, and maintained for all by the American Constitution as it is, and which inhere in the genius of American institutions. We oppose it as men who fear God, and respect the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or, so far as civil government is concerned, not to worship him at all if he chooses; we oppose it as Christians who love Christ and endeavor sincerely to do his will, and who, at the same time, maintain that, under civil government, every other man is entitled to all the rights to which the Christian is entitled; and we would have

every soul in the United States inspired with the spirit, and, we hope, with the deathless endurance, with which our own opposition is inspired.*AMS October 1888, page 74.13*

“The National Establishment of the Christian Religion” American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION AND FREE SCHOOLS.*AMS October 1888, page 74.14*

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:-AMS October 1888, page 74.15

ARTICLE

Section 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*AMS October 1888, page 74.16*

Sec. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming

to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.*AMS October 1888, page 74.17*

Sec. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve government republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.*AMS October 1888, page 74.18*

Sec. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.*AMS October 1888, page 75.1*

This amendment to the National Constitution has been offered by Senator Blair, and is now pending in Congress. It is a singular sort of a document, though hardly any more so than was to be expected in the promotion of the scheme which underlies it, *i.e.*, the establishment of a National religion. The proposed amendment is just about as flatly self-contradictory as any proposition could be. Section 1 reads as follows:-*AMS October 1888, page 75.2*

“No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”*AMS October 1888, page 75.3*

The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:-*AMS October 1888, page 75.4*

“Each State in this Union *shall establish and maintain* a system of free public schools adequate to the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and *the principles of Christian religion*.”*AMS October 1888, page 75.5*

That is to say, No State shall ever make or maintain a law respecting an establishment of religion; but every State in this Union shall make and maintain laws establishing the principles of the Christian religion. And to make assurance doubly sure, section 3 declares that*AMS October 1888, page 75.6*

“The United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.”*AMS October 1888, page 75.7*

And that is to say that the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain the principles of the Christian religion. This proposed amendment therefore, at one stroke, establishes Christianity as the National religion, *because* it declares that every State shall maintain the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools, and the Nation is pledged to see that this is done. Therefore there must be a National decision of some kind declaring just what are the principles of the Christian religion. Then when that decision shall have been made, every State will have to receive from the Nation just those principles of religion which the Nation shall have declared to be the principles of the Christian religion, and which the Nation will have pledged itself shall be taught in the public schools of every State. In other words, the people of the United States will then have to receive their religion from the Government of the United States. Therefore, if Senator Blair’s proposed amendment to the National Constitution does not provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National religion, then no religion was ever established or maintained in this world.*AMS October 1888, page 75.8*

But how shall this National decision be made as to what are the principles of the Christian religion? It would seem that the second sentence of section 2 makes provision for this. It declares that no “instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.”*AMS October 1888, page 75.9*

As therefore no religious tenets, doctrines, or beliefs can be taught in the schools, except such as are common to all denominations of the Christian religion, it will follow inevitably that there shall be officially called a National council of the churches to decide what are the principles common to all, and to establish a National creed,

which shall be enforced and inculcated by National power in all the public schools in the United States. And that will be but the establishment of a National religion. And that is exactly what Senator Blair's constitutional amendment assures, so surely as it or anything similar to it shall ever be adopted. And that is what the National Reformers intend shall be.*AMS October 1888, page 75.10*

It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century. Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. Then it became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity should be the imperial religion. To effect this an imperial council was necessary to formulate that phase of Christianity which was common to all. The Council of Nice was convened by imperial command, and an imperial creed was established, which was enforced by imperial power. That establishment of an imperial religion ended only in the imperious despotism of the Papacy.*AMS October 1888, page 75.11*

As surely as the complete establishment of the Papacy followed, and grew out of, that imperial recognition of Christianity in the fourth century, just so surely will the complete establishment of a religious despotism after the living likeness of the Papacy, follow, and grow out of, this National recognition of Christianity provided for in the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Blair, and which is now pending in Congress.*AMS October 1888, page 75.12*

The Savor of Tyranny

Senator Blair's National Sunday Bill declares that no person shall "engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, *to the disturbance of others* on the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." Some of the States already have the same sort of Sunday laws as this. California has no Sunday law, much less one of this kind. But not long ago the city of San Francisco had, on another subject, an ordinance of the same nature as this passage in the National Sunday Bill. San Francisco has no such ordinance now, however; the merit of the ordinance came up before the Supreme Court, and the whole thing was treated with the contempt which all such statutes only deserve.*AMS*

October 1888, page 75.13

The ordinance read as follows:-*AMS October 1888, page 75.14*

“No person shall in any place indulge in conduct having a tendency to annoy persons passing or being upon the public highway or upon adjacent premises.”*AMS October 1888, page 75.15*

A man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which had “a tendency to annoy” somebody; he was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says:-*AMS October 1888, page 75.16*

“The writ was made returnable before Judge Sullivan, and argued by Henry Hutton in behalf of the imprisoned offender. Disposing of the question, the Judge gave quite a lengthy written opinion, in which he passed a somewhat severe criticism upon the absurdity of the contested ordinance, and discharged Pape from custody. Said the Judge:-*AMS October 1888, page 75.17*

“If the order be law, enforceable by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in it-self, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other persons. The rival tradesman who passes one’s store with an observant eye as to the volume of business is guilty of a crime, because the very thought of rivalry and reduction of business has a tendency to annoy. The passing of the most lenient creditor has a tendency to annoy, because it is a reminder of obligations unfulfilled. The passing of a well-clad, industrious citizen, bearing about him the evidence of thrift, has a tendency to annoy the vagabond, whose laziness reduces him to a condition of poverty and discontent. The importunities of the newsboy who endeavors with such persistent energy to dispose of his stock, has a tendency to annoy the prominent citizen who has already read the papers, or who expects to find them at his door as he reaches home. He who has been foiled in an attempted wrong upon the person or property of another, finds a tendency to annoy in the very passing presence

of the person whose honesty or ingenuity has circumvented him. And so instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.*AMS October 1888, page 75.18*

“But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on unoffending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no principle so subversive of liberty as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tables that it can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar. Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable.”*AMS October 1888, page 75.19*

This decision applies with full force to Senator-Blair’s proposed National Sunday law. Under that law all that would be necessary to subject any person to a criminal prosecution, would be for him to engage in any sort of play, or game, or amusement, or recreation, on Sunday, because there are many of those rigid National Reformers who would be very much “disturbed” by any such amusement or recreation, however innocent it might be in itself. And it is left entirely to the whim or the caprice of the “disturbed” one, or of the judge or jury, to say whether the action has really disturbed him or not.*AMS October 1888, page 76.1*

The California decision is, that such a statute “sets a very severe

penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality." California courts "countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny." It is very likely that should Senator Blair's bill be enacted into a law, the United States courts would decide in the same way as did the Superior Court of California. But it is an exceedingly ominous sign, and one most startling in the danger which it displays, when a bill which so "savors of tyranny," and which embodies a "principle so subversive of liberty," can be introduced into the National Legislature, can be received and reported favorably, can pass two readings, can be spread broadcast throughout the land, and only one single voice—that of the American Sentinel—be raised against it.*AMS October 1888, page 76.2*

The American people have so long enjoyed the liberty which has been justly their boast, that they seem, from appearances, to think that now they can lie down safely and hibernate undisturbed for all time to come. We wonder what can ever awaken them. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty;" but "corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."*AMS October 1888, page 76.3*

"The National Reform Association" American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The National Reform Association is an organization composed of representative men of all "evangelical" denominations, and its object is to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, making Christianity the National religion. Among its vice-presidents are: Joseph Cook, President Seelye, Bishop Huntington of New York, George W. Bain of Kentucky, Miss Frances E. Willard, Mrs. Josephine Bateham, Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, Mrs. Hoffman, Mrs. Lathrop, and others of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, besides such a number of Reverends, D. Ds., LL. Ds., that we cannot take the time to name them, but which number in all about one hundred and twenty. All these are simply the vice-presidents of the Association. This Association, we have said, was organized to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, recognizing the Christian religion as the religion of this country, and enforcing its

precepts upon all who live under the Government. The proposed constitutional amendment introduced by Senator Blair, which we print in another column, is just the kind of an amendment which they seek to have adopted, and with this amendment they are intensely pleased. The *Christian Statesman* is the organ of that Association, and in its issue of July 18, 1888, it indorses this amendment as furnishing an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people, and as embodying principles which have been advocated by the Association for a quarter of a century. In the same paper, of September 6, Mr. John Alexander, father of the Association, urges without delay the circulation of petitions favoring the amendment in such numbers, and signed by so many people, that it will require a procession of wheel-barrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation, in the Houses of Congress. Other such commendations might be given, but these are sufficient to show how entirely the Blair amendment meets the mind of the managers of the National Reform Association.*AMS October 1888, page 76.4*

Now we propose to give a few items showing what the National Reformers wish to do when they get that which the Blair Amendment embodies.*AMS October 1888, page 76.5*

The *Christian Statesman*, of October 2, 1884, said:-*AMS October 1888, page 76.6*

"Give all men to understand that this is a Christian Nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain, by all right means, our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution... Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality."*AMS October 1888, page 76.7*

"Enforce," according to Webster, is "to force, to constrain, to compel, to execute with vigor." Therefore the proposition of the National Reformers is to force, to compel, all to keep the laws of Christian morality; to execute with vigor upon all the laws of Christian morality.*AMS October 1888, page 76.8*

It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice-presidents of the Association

declares, civil power has a right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D.D., now pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, plainly declared, in the *Christian Statesman*, of June 5, 1884, that the civil power "has the right to command the consciences of men." *AMS October 1888, page 76.9*

Rev. M.A. Gault, a district secretary, and a leading worker, of the Association says:-*AMS October 1888, page 76.10*

"Our remedy for all these malefic influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hands on any religion that does not conform to it." *AMS October 1888, page 76.11*

Rev. E. B. Graham, also a vice-president of the Association, in an address delivered at York, Nebraska, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885, said:-*AMS October 1888, page 76.12*

"We might add in all justice, if the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then if they can stand it stay there till they die." *AMS October 1888, page 76.13*

In a speech in a National Reform Convention held in New York City, in February, 1873, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D.D., named atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Christians, and summed them all up under the head of atheists, and said:-*AMS October 1888, page 76.14*

"These all are... as far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together... The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry. It is his class... The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him. They must be treated, as for this question, one party." *AMS October 1888, page 76.15*

Then he tells how they propose to deal with these people when they get what the Blair amendment supplies. He says:-*AMS October*

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man... Tolerate atheism, sir! There is nothing out of hell I would not tolerate as soon... Atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They can-not dwell together on the same continent." *AMS October 1888, page 76.17*

As though this were not enough, and as though their tolerant intentions were not sincere enough, they propose in addition to all this to join hands with the Catholic Church and enlist her efforts in their work. The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, said:-*AMS October 1888, page 76.18*

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them." *AMS October 1888, page 76.19*

These are the men, and this is the Association, which rejoices and is glad at the prospect opened before us by Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the National Constitution. This is how they propose to use the power that will be bestowed upon them if that amendment is adopted. This is the Association that is filling the country with petitions to be signed by the people asking that that amendment be adopted. With this Association both the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party are allied. *AMS October 1888, page 76.20*

Fellow-citizens, these petitions you will be asked to sign. By these presents you know who it is that is asking you to sign them. You know what they propose to do under the amendment if they succeed in securing it. What are you going to do? Will you sign the petitions and thus lend your influence to establish such a religious despotism as is here shadowed forth? or will you refuse to sign, and tell your neighbor about the wicked scheme, that he may refuse to sign? The danger is upon us, will you awake to the occasion? Do not delay your answer, but act promptly and energetically we beg of

“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union” American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The Sentinel has had occasion frequently to criticise some of the workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Upon the part of those who favor the establishment of a religious instead of a *civil* government here, this fact has been made the means of an attempt to create prejudice at the expense of the Sentinel. They try to make it appear that the American Sentinel is opposed to temperance. We propose to make plain our attitude toward temperance in general and toward the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union in particular.AMS October 1888, page 76.22

The American Sentinel is thoroughly and consistently devoted to the genuine principles of temperance. And what the Sentinel considers to be the genuine principles of temperance can be stated in this single sentence, viz.: *Total abstinence from all stimulants and narcotics of whatever kind or nature or degree.* More than this, it is out of allegiance to Christian principle that the Sentinel is devoted to this principle of temperance. It is thorough-going Christian temperance in which the Sentinel thoroughly believes. It is because allegiance to Christ demands that we shall be temperate in all things, that we advocate the principle of temperance. Both of the editors of the Sentinel are doing their very best to act strictly in accordance with this principle of temperance. It must therefore be manifest to every soul that the American Sentinel is decidedly in favor of temperance, and *Christian* temperance at that. And in this it must likewise be manifest to everybody that whatever criticisms we have ever made, or shall ever make, upon the workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, are not in any sense in opposition to the purest principles of Christian temperance.AMS October 1888, page 76.23

Although we are decidedly in favor of Christian temperance, and endeavor personally to practice it, and to persuade others to practice it, we are not in favor of using the civil power to compel anybody either to favor or to practice it. And when the Woman’s

Christian Temperance Union attempts, as it does, to use the civil power to compel people to conform to the principles of Christian temperance, it goes beyond its legitimate province, it acts contrary both to civil polity and Christian principle, and therefore we oppose it. Christian principle knows no such thing as outward force; it never seeks either the support or the control of the civil power. Christian principle knows only the force of conscientious conviction, aroused to action by persuasive reason, under the blessed influence of the Spirit of God. Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Believing this with all our heart, although we are decidedly in favor of *temperance*, of *Christian* temperance, of woman's Christian temperance, and even of woman's Christian temperance *union*, we are just as decidedly opposed to the political aspirations of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. *AMS October 1888, page 76.24*

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish a theocracy in this country, and to that end demands that the ballot shall be put into the hands of women. Proof: -*AMS October 1888, page 77.1*

"A true theocracy is yet to come;...hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause." -*W.C.T.U. Monthly Reading for September, 1886. AMS October 1888, page 77.2*

Now the establishment of a man-made, or a woman-made, theocracy will be but a repetition of the establishment and working of the hideous principles of the Papacy, if not the establishment of the Papacy itself, in this country. The Papacy is a theocracy. Its workings throughout history have been but the practice of the principles of a man-made theocracy-such a theocracy as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish here by the ballot. The rule of such a theocracy is the wickedest rule that the world has known or can know. *AMS October 1888, page 77.3*

It puts man in the place of God, and deifies human passions; and such a *regime* is but one remove from that of Satan himself.

Therefore, as such a theocracy is such a wicked thing, as it is such an utter perversion of every principle of government, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to it. And as the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to the establishment of such a theocracy, and rejoices that it has so long championed such a cause, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to *that part* of the aims and workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. And why should we be blamed for it?*AMS October 1888, page 77.4*

In order to the establishment of this theocracy here, they "pray devoutly for the ballot in the hands of women." But whenever the ballot is put into the hands of women, for any such purpose as that, then the ballot will be the worst thing that was ever put into the hands of a woman.*AMS October 1888, page 77.5*

Again; the Sentinel is first, last, and all the time, opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association. That Association likewise proposes to turn this Government into a theocracy, ruled by the "leaders and teachers in the churches." It declares that dissenters from National Reform opinions "cannot dwell together on the same continent" with the National Reformed Christianity; and that "there is nothing out of hell" that should not be "tolerated" as soon as these. In Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law and constitutional amendment, both of which are now pending in the United States Senate, the National Reformers see taken the first steps towards making effective their "tolerant" intentions. Now the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the closest ally, and the most powerful support, that the National Reform Association has in this Nation to-day. Many of the officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union are also vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. It was the Woman's Christian Temperance Union that first started the petitions for this National Sunday law, which pleases the National Reformers so well, and which so fitly plays into their hands; and the Union went before the Senate Committee with the names of one and a half million petitioners, and more to follow, in favor of that law which, in more than one of its provisions, is subversive of liberty, and which savors all over of tyranny. It is perfectly safe to say that from the position which she occupies, the present president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance

Union, herself alone, is doing more to spread National Reform ideas and principles than are all the National Reform "District Secretaries" put together. And there are other leaders of the Union who are not much behind her in this bad accomplishment.*AMS October 1888, page 77.6*

Therefore, as we are totally opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association, and as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the most powerful support of that Association, we are, consequently, totally opposed to that part of the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. And why should we not be?*AMS October 1888, page 77.7*

Nor is this all. We view with grave apprehensions the encroachments of the Papal power, on its own part, upon the civil institutions of this Government. Everybody knows that the Papacy has never wearied of condemning our public schools because they are not made the medium of religious instruction. The National Reform Association and its allies now echo the Papal condemnation, and seek to remove the cause of it, by the pending amendment to the National Constitution, in which the National power is pledged to see that every State "shall establish and maintain" a system of religious public schools. Now to secure this and the co-operation of the Papacy at the same time, the National Reform Association agrees that the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, shall be established in the public schools wherever "Roman Catholics are in the majority." And also in securing and enforcing the pending National Sunday law, the National Reformers pledge themselves to "gladly join hands" with the Roman Catholics, and to make repeated advances to secure the co-operation of the Roman Catholics "in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it." Therefore the two points,-the National Sunday law, and religion in the public schools,-upon which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is diligently working to secure National religious legislation, are the very points upon which the National Reform Association stands pledged to unite with the Papacy.*AMS October 1888, page 77.8*

Now the Woman's Christian Temperance Union supports the National Reform Association. The National Reform Association is

pledged to Rome. Rome stands pledged forever to the subversion of every principle of liberty. Therefore, as we are forever opposed to the encroachments of Rome, so we are forever opposed to that part of the working of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union which supports the National Reform Association, which is pledged to Rome. And why should we not be opposed to it? And why should not everybody else be opposed to it?*AMS October 1888, page 77.9*

We know that there are many of the women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union who do not favor the political, nor the theocratical, nor the National Reform, aspirations of the leaders of the Union. We know a number of women who have separated themselves from the workings of the Union because of the very things which we have here pointed out. They joined the Union to work for Christian temperance upon Christian principles, and to secure the practice of Christian temperance by Christian means. But when they saw that by the leadership of the Union, political efforts and means were supplanting the Christian principles, efforts, and means, they left it. They did well to leave it. And so will every other woman do well to leave it, who does not want to be sold into the hands of Rome through the political, theocratical, and National Reform aspirations of the present leadership of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.*AMS October 1888, page 77.10*

We only pray that the whole body of the Union, leadership and all, may awake to the danger of their position before they shall have delivered the civil power, and themselves and us all with it, into the hands of a religious despotism.*AMS October 1888, page 77.11*

"The Prohibition Party" American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Not long since one of the editors of the Sentinel made a speech in San Diego, Cal., on religious legislation in general, and Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law and religious amendment to the Constitution in particular. We gave a sketch of the theocratical workings of the church, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Prohibition party, with the National Reform Association, and

the aim of the National Reformers to hand over the whole thing to the Papacy as soon as the Papacy is ready. The San Diego *Sun* stated that in this we “assumed what every member of these organizations will promptly deny.” We do not think that the statement of facts can rightly be considered assumption. As to the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, we give our position in regard to that elsewhere in this paper. We wish now to show that when we name the Prohibition party in the same category we *assume* nothing. *AMS October 1888, page 77.12*

It cannot be denied that the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association are pledged to the establishment of a theocracy in this country. Nor can it be denied that the Prohibition party is inseparably connected with both the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association. The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union demands the ballot in the hands of women, in order to establish a theocracy; the Prohibition party is pledged to secure the ballot in the hands of women; therefore the Prohibition party is pledged to the establishment of this woman-made theocracy. In order to establish a theocracy, the National Reform Association demands a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to legislate in religious things; a leading Prohibitionist-Senator Blair-proposes in Congress just such an amendment, accompanied by a bill legislating upon things pertaining to God; and the *Lever*, in commending the “*moral* element,” in the make-up of the Prohibition party, “the foundation” for which is laid in the recognition of “Almighty God as the source of all power in government,” says:-*AMS October 1888, page 77.13*

“At this point the Prohibition party stands out in bold contrast with the old parties. It recognizes the authority of God in human government, and proposes that all legislation shall be in harmony with Christian morality.” *AMS October 1888, page 77.14*

This is precisely what the National Reform Association has in view, therefore the aim of the Prohibition party and the aim of the National Reform Association are identical. And besides this the National Reformers have pledged themselves to join hands with the Catholic Church as soon as *she* is ready. *AMS October 1888, page 77.15*

More than this, this is only that at which the Papacy itself is aiming in this country. Pope Leo XIII commands that,*AMS October 1888, page 77.16*

“All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church.”*AMS October 1888, page 77.17*

Senator Blair’s constitutional amendment and religious legislation are modeled exactly “on the principles of the true church;” and the Prohibition party is pledged to such legislation; therefore the aim of the Prohibition party and the aim of the Catholic Church, so far as religious legislation is concerned, are identical. *And they are working together to secure it.* At the county Prohibition convention for Tulare County, Cal., held in Tulare City not long ago, a Catholic priest was introduced by a Methodist minister, and made a strong speech and offered the Catholic Church free to the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, at any time, to hold their Prohibition unions in. About the same time a Catholic priest spoke in a Prohibition convention in Los Angeles, in which he made most prominent the necessity for religious legislation, particularly in regard to enforcing the observance of “the Lord’s day,” as Senator Blair’s Sunday Bill provides. These things greatly please the Prohibition party, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and the-Catholic Church.*AMS October 1888, page 78.1*

Now we would like for some Prohibitionist to tell just about how much any advocacy of Prohibition by the Catholic Church is worth, while everybody knows that there is not a saloon keeper in all the land who cannot keep a saloon and be a member of the Catholic Church as long as he lives, and (if he pays money enough) go straight through purgatory without even getting scorched, when he dies. We can tell what it is worth, and that is, just what influence and support the Catholic Church can get out of the Prohibitionists in accomplishing the Papal scheme of causing “the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church.”*AMS October 1888, page 78.2*

That is what it is worth, and that is all it is worth. But if the Prohibitionists think that a safe investment, they have vastly more

confidence in the wheedling charms of the Papacy than we have. For we never can forget the truth of Macaulay's words, that-*AMS October 1888, page 78.3*

"The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity [of Rome] to such perfection that, among the contrivances for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place."-*Essays Von Ranke.AMS October 1888, page 78.4*

"Rev." "Sam" Small, the associate revivalist with "Sam" Jones, was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention, held at Indianapolis. And what he wants to see, as stated in his own words at Kansas City last winter, is this:-*AMS October 1888, page 78.5*

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, National, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws."-*AMS October 1888, page 78.6*

Was ever the Papacy more than that? Did ever the Papacy ask more than that? *Could it ask more?AMS October 1888, page 78.7*

From these evidences it is plain that the Prohibition party, as it is, is set for the establishment of a religious despotism of which the Papacy shall be at least a part. And whoever works for, or votes, the Prohibition ticket, works and votes for the establishment of such a despotism.*AMS October 1888, page 78.8*

The following letter, from a prominent Prohibitionist in an Eastern State, but who does not work for the Prohibition party as at present constituted, is sound and to the point:-*AMS October 1888, page 78.9*

"The church may adopt any form of government for itself that it chooses, but must keep hands off the civil government. The worst despotism the world ever experienced was under a theocracy. The church party, misnamed Prohibition party, seeks to proselyte and carry on a religious crusade under the guise of a so-called political party. Put that party in power, and the priest and minister would

supersede the judge, the jury would disappear, civil courts would give place to ecclesiastical courts, the public court-room to the star chamber, the ordinary jail to the inquisition.*AMS October 1888, page 78.10*

"My vote, and my voice, shall ever be for a free, civil, enlightened, and progressive Government.*AMS October 1888, page 78.11*

"I am a dyed-in-the-wool Prohibitionist, and daily practice what I preach, but do not belong to the clerical party."*AMS October 1888, page 78.12*

This letter exactly expresses the views of the Sentinel. The American Sentinel is entirely and consistently in favor of Prohibition; but it is not in any sense in favor of religious legislation. What we here say is not against Prohibition, but against the religious legislation element, the Church and State element, in the Prohibition party and in the Prohibition platform. Opposition to Church and State was hissed and yelled down in the California State Prohibition Convention of 1888. And a consistent Prohibitionist told the Prohibition party in that same convention, that if they went into the campaign with the platform as it is, "they would have to pass half the time in convincing the people that it was not a religious movement." The Prohibition party, both State and National, have gone into the campaign with that very platform, and that party may spend *all* the time in the endeavor, but it can never convince any thinking person that it is not a religious movement. The Prohibition movement as it is now manifested in the Prohibition party, and under its present platform, is nothing else than a religious movement; and that is only what the majority of the preachers, whether Protestant or Catholic, have in view who are making themselves so prominent in behalf of Prohibition-they are only making Prohibition the stepping-stone to religious legislation, and the establishment of their own power by it. And in view of the ecclesiastical engineering of the Prohibition party, Dean Milman's weighty words are of living importance to every American citizen: "In proportion as ecclesiastics become co-legislators, heresies become civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments."*AMS October 1888, page 78.13*

The American Sentinel is in favor of Prohibition everywhere and all the time; but it is not in favor of religious legislation anywhere at any time. We would shut the saloon everywhere and forever, not because it is irreligious nor because it is violative of the law of God, for with such reasons the civil power can have nothing to do, but because it is uncivil. If the saloon were only irreligious, or were only violative of the law of God, the State would have no right to interfere with it to any extent whatever. But as it is essentially uncivil, the State can and ought to abolish it entirely, yet never with any question as to whether or not it is irreligious or violative of the law of God. We would shut the saloon for the same reason that we prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons.*AMS October 1888, page 78.14*

We know there are many Prohibitionists who, like the correspondent whose words we have quoted, are as much opposed to religious legislation, or priests in politics, or churches in civil affairs, as we are; we know that in the California State Prohibition Convention there were powerful speeches made against the Church and State element in the Prohibition party; but that element carried the day, and that element rules in the so-called Prohibition party; and whoever would not help forward the union of Church and State, and the establishment of a religious despotism in this Nation, should be as far as the East is from the West from voting this present Prohibition ticket, or working in any way for the Prohibition party as it is.*AMS October 1888, page 78.15*

“Notes” American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6 M.A. Gault says:*AMS October 1888, page 78.16*

“I had a long talk with Hon. T. C. Richmond leader of the Prohibition party in Wisconsin. He is a popular speaker and a logical reasoner. He is almost constantly in the field addressing large audiences, endeavoring to convince the people that the Prohibition party should drop every other issue but Prohibition.”*AMS October 1888, page 78.17*

Mr. Richmond's idea is correct. If Prohibition is what the Prohibitionists want, why are they not willing to work for that alone? If Prohibition is what they want, why are they not willing to secure the help of every element that can be enlisted in favor of Prohibition? The very fact that the so-called Prohibition party will not work for Prohibition alone, is proof that the religio-political managers of that party are only using the Prohibition issue as a stepping-stone to the establishment of their power, and the subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power.*AMS October 1888, page 78.18*

"Oakland Lawyers on the Blair Bills" American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Public interest has recently been so directed to the two measures proposed by Senator Blair namely, "a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United State respecting establishments of religion and free schools," and the "bill is secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship," that the *Tribune* of this city deemed the matter of sufficient importance to call for the opinions of the Oakland bar upon the proposed legislation. Accordingly a reporter of that paper submitted copies of the Blair bills to number of attorneys and asked for an expression of opinion on them, with the following result:-*AMS October 1888, page 78.19*

H. L. Adams-I gave my opinions through the columns of the *Tribune* last week, but will repeat sufficiently to say that while I was formerly of the opinion that the first day should be general; enjoined by statute, a careful study of the question has led me to change my views in that regard, and I now believe that any law which compels the observance of one day of the week upon all classes of people without regard to their religious belief constrains them of their liberty and is in violation of the form of thought and religious worship guaranteed by the inventors of this Government in the present Federal Constitution.*AMS October 1888, page 78.20*

J. R. Glascock-It is an infringement upon the personal liberty of the people. It is a step back ward and not forward. If carried to its

legitimate result it would relegate us to the days of Connecticut blue laws. Church and State should be kept as far apart as possible. Let our schools teach knowledge and not religion.*AMS October 1888, page 78.21*

In this opinion Mr. Glascock recognizes the fact that religious legislation of any description whatever is a virtual union of Church and State whether that legislation be in the interests of one denomination or of many. The next opinion likewise covers both the bill and the amendment:-*AMS October 1888, page 78.22*

A. L. Frick-I am opposed to teaching the principles of the Christian religion or any other religion in the schools. Religious education should be left to the church and the home. The Sunday bill in my opinion is unjust and unwise. I believe in Sunday regulations only in so far as necessary to protect persons in the uninterrupted observance of worship, and this matter should be left to the several States as distinguished from the Federal Government.*AMS October 1888, page 79.1*

This opinion might seem to favor State regulation of Sunday observance, but a careful reading of it will reveal the fact that it does nothing of the sort. Every State now has wholesome and just laws protecting from disturbance all religious assemblies, as indeed all lawful assemblies, and so all that is indicated by Mr. Frick as a duty of the State with regard to Sunday is already secured without Sunday laws.*AMS October 1888, page 79.2*

S. F. Daniels, ex-Police Judge-I am not in favor of this resolution. I think that the teaching of religion should be kept entirely out of our free schools. I do not see how it could be beneficial in any way. I am opposed to Christian religion or any other religion being taught in our schools. With regard to the Sunday law, I am opposed to it. We had a Sunday law in the State at one time, and as Police Judge I had to enforce it, but I did not think it was right, being an injustice to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. Neither do I believe in prohibiting persons from observing any day they choose to. I think that should be left entirely with the conscience.*AMS October 1888, page 79.3*

J. M. Poston, ex-City Attorney of Oakland-I think the amendment of

the Constitution is impracticable, inasmuch as it involves the union of Church and State, to which I am positively opposed. As to the Blair Sunday Bill, I think some parts of that are impracticable, and interfere with the rights of the State, and I think it is the work of a crank anyway. I think that the matter of educational system belongs to the State.*AMS October 1888, page 79.4*

Here again the idea that the proposed amendment involves a union of Church and State is made prominent.*AMS October 1888, page 79.5*

J. K. Piersol-I am not in favor of having any law for the establishment of religion in the school. I am in favor of education and the teaching of morality, but not the teaching of any religion. I am in favor of all classes of people refraining from work one day in the week, but that their conscience should be their guide as to which day they observe as a rest day. I think the penalty clause of the Blair bill is useless.*AMS October 1888, page 79.6*

George M. Shaw-I do not think it would be advisable to amend the Constitution. I think the inventors of the Constitution understood that matter. I think that is going too far with the Sunday law. Any regulation of that question would be a serious disturbance to the country, and I am not in favor of interfering with a person's religious belief.*AMS October 1888, page 79.7*

L. N. Church-I think that religion in the schools is all right so far as morality and virtue are concerned; but I could not indorse the sentiment of the bill as it reads, as no one should be restricted in his religious belief.*AMS October 1888, page 79.8*

Bernard McFadden-I do not think that religion should be taught in the public schools. Thomas H. Smith-I am not in favor of the principles of Christian religion in schools, for this reason, that they have no right to teach one religion to the exclusion of all others. In regard to the Sunday bill, I am in favor of the observance of the first day; but I believe that every man should have the privilege of worshipping Almighty God whenever he wants to do so without the interference of others. I think more can be done by moral suasion than by the State.*AMS October 1888, page 79.9*

E. C. Robinson-I am opposed to any union of Church and State. I believe there should be no work done on the day set apart for rest; but I think every man should have the privilege of worshiping according to the dictates of his own conscience.*AMS October 1888, page 79.10*

A. M. Church-Keep Church and State separate forever. Morality is all well enough, but the “principles of Christian religion” should be left out. We had better let the Constitution entirely alone so far as it relates to the rights of a man’s conscience.*AMS October 1888, page 79.11*

Judge F. B. Ogden-If you strike out that portion that relates to the Christian religion being taught in the schools it would be all right. I think religion should be taught at home and in the churches. Such a law as that would inaugurate a union of Church and State. I do not like the Blair Sunday Bill for this reason-I believe that each State should set apart one day for rest, but I do not believe in prohibiting innocent pleasure.*AMS October 1888, page 79.12*

Judge Ogden is the only one expressing himself unreservedly in favor of even State Sunday laws, and even he recognizes in the Blair bills an attempt to unite Church and State.*AMS October 1888, page 79.13*

E. C. Chapman-I believe in the principles of morality, but I do not believe that States should have the right to legislate on these things at all. I do not believe in teaching religion of any kind in the public schools. I am not in favor of any law that would force people to observe any particular day.*AMS October 1888, page 79.14*

J. W. Harris-I indorse the statement of Mr. Chapman*AMS October 1888, page 79.15*

A. C. Lawson-If the principles of virtue and morality be taught, I think that is all that is necessary. With regard to the Sunday bill, I believe that any measure to set apart any particular day as a day for religious worship is in opposition to the Constitution of the United States, and whenever the Government projects to put the religious element under its wing it is wrong. I am a believer in the first day of the week as a day of worship, but I am not in favor of forcing it upon

anyone else.*AMS October 1888, page 79.16*

S. B. McKee-I should not favor the teaching of any particular religion in the schools. In reference to the Blair Sunday Bill, I understand that the foundation of our Government was religious liberty for all classes. The courts have held the observance of Sunday, but I think it is impractical from a business standpoint, and against the policy of the country.*AMS October 1888, page 79.17*

Robert L. McKee-I am decidedly opposed to any instruction in Christianity in our free public-school system.*AMS October 1888, page 79.18*

William Lair Hill, of the firm of Davis & Hill-In regard to these matters I am a Baptist, and therefore, of course, I am positively of the opinion that religion should be taught in churches and not in public schools. I see no reason for legislating the Christian religion into the State, which (under the principles of our Government, and the only true principles of any civil Government), would not apply with equal force in favor of legislating. Mohammedanism and Buddhism and Confucianism into those countries where these religions have already the majority of the people.*AMS October 1888, page 79.19*

Thus it is seen that the *consensus* of opinions among the lawyers of Oakland is that Sunday laws are subversive of religious liberty, that they are religious legislation, and that the success of the Blair bills would unite Church and State in this country. But it is to just such measures as this that the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Prohibition party stand pledged.*AMS October 1888, page 79.20*

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Doctor Crafts reports that between three and four million names have already been secured to the petitions in behalf of the National Sunday law.*AMS October 1888, page 80.1*

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition

party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizers have ceased to organize local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas. So says District Secretary M.A. Gault in the *American*, June 27, 1888.*AMS October 1888, page 80.2*

The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in Pittsburg September 14; and one of its recommendations is this:-*AMS October 1888, page 80.3*

“That Secretary Weir be appointed especially to press the cause of National Reform upon the attention of political parties, during the next four years, and to enlist, as far as possible, in this endeavor the influence of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.”*AMS October 1888, page 80.4*

The National Reform Association is circulating for signatures petitions to Congress asking that Senator Blair’s proposed religious amendment to the Constitution may be passed by Congress and submitted to the States for their approval. One of these petitions was presented to the Prohibition County Convention of Wood County, Ohio, August 8. It was unanimously indorsed, and a copy of a resolution to that effect was sent to Senator Blair, together with the respects of the convention.*AMS October 1888, page 80.5*

John Alexander, of Philadelphia, is the father of the National Reform Association, as such, and in the *Christian Statesman* of September 6 he congratulates the Association on the introduction of the Blair religious amendment to the Constitution; declares “the National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption;” and further says:-*AMS October 1888, page 80.6*

“Let us begin without delay the circulation of petitions (to be furnished in proper form by the Association), and let an opportunity be given to all parts of the country to make up a roll of petitions so great that it will require a procession of wheelbarrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation in the Houses of Congress.” And “let a mass convention of the friends of the cause be held in Washington, when the Blair

resolution shall be under discussion, to accompany with its influence the presentation of the petitions, and to take such other action as may be deemed best to arouse the Nation to a genuine enthusiasm in behalf of our National Christianity.”*AMS October 1888, page 80.7*

Isn't it about time that somebody was arousing to a genuine sense of the danger to civil and religious liberty that inheres in this scheme?*AMS October 1888, page 80.8*

The *California Christian Advocate* some weeks ago gravely informed its readers that “Congressman Plumb, of Kansas, has offered an amendment to the Sunday Civil Bill providing an appropriation for the building of a public drinking fountain in the Capitol.” Of course the bill to which the Kansas Congressman has offered an amendment is the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill; but in these days of proposed Sunday legislation it is perhaps not strange that the friends of Sunday laws fail to discern what to them seem so small a difference. The time may come, however, when even the Sundry Appropriation Bill may contain clauses relative to Sunday, and then it will indeed be literally the “Sunday Civil Bill.”*AMS October 1888, page 80.9*

Rev. R.C. Wylie says the National Reformers should advocate Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution.*AMS October 1888, page 80.10*

“Because of the aid it will give us in discussing National Reform principles. Some of these are clearly embodied in the amendment. Senator Blair's amendment marks an epoch in our history... The pulpit and the platform should herald the truths it teaches, from ocean to ocean.”*AMS October 1888, page 80.11*

Yes, the amendment will not only aid in discussing National Reform principles, it will also, if adopted, most materially aid the National Reformers in carrying those principles into practice by the civil power, and in satisfying their intense longing to tolerate dissenters as lunatics and conspirators are tolerated.*AMS October 1888, page 80.12*

The *Tribune* of this city thinks that we are needlessly alarmed about

the Blair Sunday Bill. The *Tribune* evidently does not understand the situation. The bill in question may fail to become a law, but that does not prove by any means that the serious consideration of such a measure is not a menace to religious liberty in this country. *AMS October 1888, page 80.13*

The systematic and persistent efforts which are being made by hundreds of thousands of people banded together in various churches, associations, and societies throughout our land to secure religious legislation in this country, should arouse every liberty-loving citizen to a sense of danger, and set him to work to enlighten others in regard to National Reform designs and practices. *AMS October 1888, page 80.14*

Senator Blair may be, as the *Tribune* intimates, a harmless “crank,” but there are many thousands afflicted with the same religious-legislation mania, and there is a dangerous method in their madness. We cannot afford to settle down in fancied security when such measures are being seriously proposed in the Senate of the United States. *AMS October 1888, page 80.15*

The latter part of July, “Sam” Jones, the great revivalist, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans, who went over there to hear him. One of his devout, elegantly refined, and intensely instructive passages was this:—*AMS October 1888, page 80.16*

“Now I’ll tell you, I think we are running the last political combat on the lines we have been running them on. It is between the Republicans and Democrats, this contest, and it is the last the Republicans will make in America. The Democrats are going in overwhelmingly. Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be, God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, Heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on.” *AMS October 1888, page 80.17*

And this the *Christian Statesman* inserts under the heading, “The National Reform Movement!” It is very appropriately placed. It is a worthy addition to the literature of the National Reform movement.

But what consummate mountebanks many of those popular “revivalists” do make of themselves!*AMS October 1888, page 80.18*

As was to be expected, the National Reformers are delighted with Senator Blair’s religious amendment to the Constitution. It is in substance just what they have been working for all these years. The *Christian Statesman* of July 12 says the amendment “should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians.” In its issue of July 19 the Statesman says:-*AMS October 1888, page 80.19*

“Senator Blair’s proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people.”*AMS October 1888, page 80.20*

Then, after mentioning “Christianity, the religion of the Nation,” and “the Bible, the text-book of our common Christianity, in all the schools,” it says:-*AMS October 1888, page 80.21*

“These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?”*AMS October 1888, page 80.22*

We are afraid that the iniquitous scheme will ultimately carry.*AMS October 1888, page 80.23*

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 9, Rev. R.C. Wylie praises Senator Blair’s proposed constitutional amendment, because it would, if adopted, give the National Reformers many advantages which they have not now. He says:-*AMS October 1888, page 80.24*

“We would then have a vantage-ground we have not now. The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection, which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us.”*AMS October 1888, page 80.25*

That is to say: The charge of invading the rights of conscience has, so far, lain against the National Reformers; but now, if this amendment is carried, this charge will lie against the amendment, and will spend itself there while the National Reformers escape. This charge is justly made against the National Reformers; for they distinctly affirm that the civil power has the right to compel the consciences of men. And the admission that if the amendment were adopted the charge would then lie against that, is a confession that the proposed amendment, if adopted, will invade the rights of conscience. And that is the truth. It will surely do so. If it would not, it would not be so heartily indorsed by the National Reformers.*AMS October 1888, page 80.26*

November 1888

“Jonathan Edwards’s Speech” American Sentinel 3, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

[This speech was delivered at the National Convention of the National Reform Association, held in New York City, February 26, 27, 1873. It is part of the published proceedings of that convention, and, together with the other speeches, is circulated to this very day, as representative National Reform literature. Although extracts have previously been made from it in the Sentinel, we publish a large portion of it at the present time, in order that our readers may feel fully assured that there is necessity for just such work as the Sentinel is doing; and that in op-posing what is miscalled National Reform, we are opposing nothing but a scheme of wicked selfishness. The few comments that we make will be found in brackets. E.J.W.]*AMS November 1888, page 84.1*

We want State and Religion-and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require Religion, it shall be revealed Religion, the Religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land “an undeniable legal basis.” We use the word Religion in its proper sense, as meaning a man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God..*AMS November 1888, page 84.2*

[What is Christian morality? It is simple Christianity. As Mr. Edwards says, it is “a man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God.” And this takes in not simply outward acts, but the thoughts and intents of the heart. This is what Mr. Edwards and the National Reform Association want to see placed on “an undeniable legal basis.” That is, the Christian religion and Christian morality shall be enforced by law. A man’s personal relation to God, in matters of faith and obedience, is to be interfered with by the law of the land. In reality, the National Reform Association proposes that no man shall have any direct, personal relation with God, but that he shall approach God only through the medium of the State, controlled by “the Church.” In other words, the State Church is to be to the individual in the place of God. And what will that be but another

Papacy, or an exact copy of the present one? Nothing else in the world.*AMS November 1888, page 84.3*

But it will be asked, “How will it be possible for the State to deal with Christian morality, since it has to do with the thoughts of the heart, and the faith which one holds? How can the laws take cognizance of a man’s thoughts and personal belief?” In the very same way that the Papacy did, in whose steps the National Reform Association is following, and after which it is modeled. By means of the inquisition the church forced the mass of people to believe just what it wanted them to believe. Whenever a man was suspected of heresy, he was dragged into the secret chamber, and was stretched upon the rack. In most cases that succeeded in making him an obedient child of the church. Yes, the church will have ample power to deal with heretics when it has its dogmas fixed on an “undeniable legal basis.” The rack, the thumbscrew, and the stake are wonderful promoters of “orthodoxy.” To say that the National Reform theocracy when formed would not follow the Papacy in this respect just as much as in the formation of a man-made theocracy, is to say that men are now made of different material from what they were three hundred years ago. Religious persecution will be the necessary result of the success of the National Reform Association.*AMS November 1888, page 84.4*

Now, we are warned that to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists who would be sufferers under it. I accept it as a compliment that we are called upon to consider objections of this sort, if there be any ground for them. We are the conscience party, the free conscience party. We are the very people to be held responsible if we trespass upon the conscience of others. And it will be found that we do not intend to do this, and that we do not do it in fact...*AMS November 1888, page 84.5*

The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.*AMS November 1888, page 84.6*

The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.*AMS November 1888, page 84.7*

The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.*AMS November 1888, page 84.8*

The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.*AMS November 1888, page 84.9*

These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry-the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party. Now look at it-look at this controversy. The question is not between opinions that differ, but opinions that are opposite, that are contradictory, that mutually exclude each other. It is between Christianity and infidelity. It is between theism and atheism, between the acknowledgement of a God and the denial that there is any God. We cannot too seriously ponder this, since the rights of conscience are held to be involved. The atheist does not believe in the soul; he denies that there is any such thing as conscience; yet he comes to those who confess both to insist upon his rights of conscience! I have a few plain, earnest words about all this.*AMS November 1888, page 84.10*

I do not believe that every man is an atheist who says he is one. I distinguish between minds that doubt or deny the existence of God, and those who doubt or deny the sufficiency of the logic usually

employed to prove it. And I love to think genuine atheism impossible to the human soul. But now bring forward your atheist, your man who confesses to neither God, angel, nor Spirit, your man who believes in all unbelief, and in nothing else, and I know at once what his position is. His religion is irreligion; his morals are only natural morals-the morals of the body, the animal in man, which, in his view, is all there is of man. His speculations do not rove or float among the dreams of philosophy, but they run into the concrete forms of politics-into the plat-forms of parties and the enactments of Legislatures. Atheism is always political. What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. He not only rejects and opposes my faith, but he aims to overturn every institution, and to dissolve every relationship growing out of my faith. He would destroy the very foundations, pull down everything, and build up nothing. But he shall be tolerated. He may live and go free, hold his lands and enjoy his home, he may even vote, but for any higher, more advanced citizen-ship, he is, as I hold, utterly disqualified. And we are aiming, not to increase, but to render definite his disqualification; to give to our Government and all our free institutions a guarantee that he shall never have control over them.*AMS November 1888, page 84.11*

[In the above declarations, we have religious persecution defended as plainly as words can do so. Notice: The man who believes in God, the Bible, and the gospel of Jesus Christ, but who differs with the mass of professed Christians solely upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as the Sabbath, is declared to be an atheist. The man who observes the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, is declared by this representative of the National Reform Association, to be an atheist, although he implicitly believes in God and the Bible, and trusts in Jesus Christ as his Saviour. He conscientiously observes the seventh day as a religious duty, and does it as an act of worship to the God who created "the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is," yet he is to be treated as an atheist. And what sort of treatment is the atheist to receive? He is to be treated as a conspirator or a lunatic. That is, he is to be kept underground, and shut up. If he has

the courage of his convictions, and attempts to teach others what he believes to be a matter of solemn obligation to God, he is "raving," and must be shut up as a dangerous man. One would suppose that Ignatius Loyola must be the patron saint of the National Reform Association. Whatever plea its leaders make, they invariably run into religious persecution. That is the logic of National religion.][*AMS November 1888, page 84.12*

Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist, but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith. He is bent on exterminating me and my faith altogether. "Crush the wretch!" said Voltaire of my Saviour and his cause. And this is still the atheist's motto and his aim. I have received letters and tracts which show this very clearly. Were I to read to you the shocking blasphemies, the words of hate and of murder, which they contain, you would shudder in horror. He means to make all these words good among us as soon as he can. And I am asked to accord rights of conscience to a man who says to me, "Come, let me show you how I can use the knife with which I purpose one day to cut your throat." "Come, let me explain to you the force of some nitroglycerine which I have prepared to blow you up!" I can be as calm and as willing in the one case as in the other. And I am asked to tolerate the atheist's creed under peril of violating the rights of conscience. And this tolerating of atheism means, I suppose, that our Constitution and laws shall be so framed as to imply that there is as much of truth, probability, and good in atheism as in Christianity! Tolerate atheism in this sense, sir? Never, never! We know what atheism is, and what atheism does. We know what it builds, and how it operates with its "Natural Morals," its "Death an Eternal Sleep," its "Liberty. Equality, Fraternity." Twice, at least, in the world's history has it shown what it is capable of doing. Twice across the plains of gay and sunny France has it driven its car of progress, and the whole track has been rapine, and blasphemy, and blood.*AMS November 1888, page 85.1*

[If this is a true specimen of National Reform Christianity, may we be delivered from it. That it is a fair representation, cannot be denied. Few, however, are so incautious as Mr. Edwards, in

revealing the true inwardness of the scheme. The argument is, "The atheist does not tolerate me, therefore I will not tolerate him. He does not love me, therefore I will not love him." Christ says: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven." *Matthew 5:44, 45.* But the National Reform idea of Christianity is just the opposite of this. It is to hate those that hate you, and to set them an example in hating, and to give them cause for hatred by hating them first. Therefore it is as plain as anything can be that National Reform religion is antichristian. How could it be anything else? It is modeled after the Papacy, and the Papacy is antichrist. While there are many good people who are indifferent now, or are even in the ranks of the National Reformers, because of imperfect knowledge, the time will soon come when no man can be a Christian-that is, a real follower of Christ-unless he actively opposes the work of what is called National Reform. National Reformers accuse us of joining hands with infidels in opposing their work. We oppose it because we are Christians, and because we want the pure religion of Christ to have free course].*AMS November 1888, page 85.2*

I can tolerate difference and discussion; I can tolerate heresy and false religion; I can debate the use of the Bible in our common schools, the taxation of church property, the propriety of chaplaincies and the like, but there are some questions past debate. Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon. The atheist may live, as I said, but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent. And let us note that this atheism among us is busy. It is aggressive, with societies, with organs, with agents, with their papers and their preachers. But recently they have imported a man, the papers say, at a salary of \$15,000, to go through the land lecturing and organizing, telling us how to Germanize and un-Americanize our country. Their organizations raise money, issue publications, form public sentiment, and secure votes against our Sunday laws, our blasphemy laws, our temperance laws, our cruelty laws, our laws

for social purity and home sanctity, our oath-sealed guaranty for truth and fidelity, and to bring us all down to mere natural morals. We, too, must organize and make effort. "The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge!" *AMS November 1888, page 85.3*

Another anticipated difficulty which is urged against us is to determine what Bible to recognize. This difficulty is but imaginary. There is but one Bible. What is called the Catholic or the Protestant Bible is but the Catholic or the Protestant version of the one original Bible. And with every strong conviction that the Protestant version is the better one, I am free to say that any Bible is better than no Bible. *AMS November 1888, page 85.4*

And yet another objection is that the laws of Moses will have to be re-enacted and enforced among us, and that these laws are not at all fitted to our times, our freedom, our civilization. I confess that I am not at all afraid of Moses. I find among his institutions the germs of our own glorious republic, and the provisions and the spirit of our best laws. But the objectors do not seem to have read the Bible enough to see what a self-interpreting book it is. It records a prophecy, and afterwards records its fulfillment. It records a promise, and afterwards states when and how the bestowment was effected. It records a ritual, and afterwards records what abrogated it and took its place. It gives of itself the clue to distinguish what is of enduring value and moral obligation from what is local, typical, transitory. Now, if there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out-there cannot be many of them-and we are prepared to accept them and have them re-enacted. Thus much as to objections and objectors... *AMS November 1888, page 85.5*

[Nothing more is needed than to ask the reader to stop a minute and consider the un-paralleled presumption of this statement. Could anything more clearly show the spirit of the Papacy? The apostle Paul described the Pope as "that man of sin," "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." *2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4*. And what

position does the National Reform Association occupy? It proposes to occupy the very same position. If there is anything in the Old Testament that has not passed away,-that was not transitory and local, and that has not expired by statute of limitation,-they propose to re-enact it when they set up their theocracy. That is to say, that none of the laws of God will be valid until they have set to them the seal of their approval. What more could they say to show that by their proposed scheme of government they oppose and exalt themselves above all that is called God?]*AMS November 1888, page 85.6*

It will not do to say, We had better leave things as they now are. Things are in a state of change, of transition; they will not stay as they now are. It will not do to say, Let us trust the voice of a Christian people for the perpetuity of Christian principles and usages among us; for, in despite of their voice and their influence, the moulding, over-riding force of our national Constitution has more and more eliminated the notion of God and of moral character from our recent State Constitutions and from the decisions of our courts. If we do not carry this measure, we take the side of atheism. You are called upon, fellow-citizens, to make your election between Christianity and atheism. "Under which king, Bezonian?" You cannot be too soon in making your response. I cannot doubt what your decision will be.*AMS November 1888, page 85.7*

[We would that we could be assured that the great majority of the people would decide against such a scheme of iniquity as this. But we have no such hope. Our greatest hope and desire are to arouse those who still have the spirit of true Protestantism in their hearts. It matters not how many fine speeches National Reformers may make, nor what good professions they may make, it is by such utterances as those that we have been considering that the thing must be judged. To all who read this, we say, You are called upon to make your decision between the religion of Christ and that of antichrist. Which will you choose? You cannot be too soon in making your response.]*AMS November 1888, page 85.8*

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* says:-*AMS November 1888, page 88.1*

“The American Sentinel is gradually defining its position, and American Christians will know exactly where to find it.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.2*

Yes, we intend that “American Christians” and everybody else shall know exactly where to find the Sentinel.*AMS November 1888, page 88.3*

National Reform petitions in favor of Senator Blair’s constitutional amendment, are being circulated for signatures. They will be presented to you before long, and when they are, you want to bear in mind that that amendment provides for the establishment of a National religion, and a consequent religious despotism.*AMS November 1888, page 88.4*

The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in Pittsburgh September 14; and one of its recommendations is this:-*AMS November 1888, page 88.5*

“That Secretary Weir be appointed especially to press the cause of National Reform upon the attention of political parties, during the next four years, and to enlist, as far as possible, in this endeavor the influence of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.6*

In 1596, when James VI. of Scotland (I. of England), was attempting to force Episcopacy upon Scotland, a number of the Scottish clergy had an interview with the king, and when his Majesty accused them of holding seditious meetings (for so he characterized the meetings of the church for its own purposes), and of alarming the country without reason, one of them, Andrew Melville, thus answered him:-*AMS November 1888, page 88.7*

“Sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James, the head of this commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the king of the church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member... We will yield to you your place, and give you all due

obedience; but again I say, You are not the head of the church; you cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for even in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then freely to meet in the name of Christ, and to attend to the interests of that church of which you are the chief member.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.8*

Which was equivalent to saying that they recognized the king’s authority in civil matters, but that in matters of religion they acknowledged no sovereign but Christ. And that is just what the Lord himself taught when he said: “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.” It is to be regretted that all men have not as clear views of the true relation of Church and State as were expressed by Andrew Melville to King James.*AMS November 1888, page 88.9*

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6, M.A. Gault says:-*AMS November 1888, page 88.10*

“I had a long talk with Hon. T. C. Richmond, leader of the Prohibition party in Wisconsin. He is a popular speaker and a logical reasoner. He is almost constantly in the field addressing large audiences, endeavoring to convince the people that the Prohibition party should drop every other issue but Prohibition.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.11*

Mr. Richmond’s idea is correct. If Prohibition is what the Prohibitionists want, why are they not willing to work for that alone? If Prohibition is what they want, why are they not willing to secure the help of every element that can be enlisted in favor of Prohibition? The very fact that the so-called Prohibition party will not work for Prohibition alone, is proof that the religio-political managers of that party are only using the Prohibition issue as a stepping-stone to the establishment of their power, and the subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power.*AMS November 1888, page 88.12*

A short time ago a preacher in Selma, Cal., delivered a sermon on Temperance, Prohibition, etc., in which he said:-*AMS November 1888, page 88.13*

“We have laws to punish the man who steals our property; but we have no law to prevent people from working on Sunday. It is right

that the thief be punished; but I have more sympathy for that man than I have for him that works on that day.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.14*

This is directly in the line of things promised by the Prohibition party. Whenever any party sets itself up as the protector of the Lord, and legislates upon things pertaining to God, then offenses, or supposed offenses, against God take precedence of all things else. Heresy becomes the highest crime. Then the thief will be let run, and receive sympathy, while the man who quietly works at his lawful and honest calling is prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned. And Senator Blair’s proposed amendment and Sunday law open the way for such men as this to carry their views into effect, by the civil power.*AMS November 1888, page 88.15*

The *Tribune* of this city thinks that we are needlessly alarmed about the Blair Sunday Bill. The *Tribune* evidently does not understand the situation. The bill in question may fail to become a law, but that does not prove by any means that the serious consideration of such a measure is not a menace to religious liberty in this country.*AMS November 1888, page 88.16*

The systematic and persistent efforts which are being made by hundreds of thousands of people banded together in various churches, associations, and societies throughout our land to secure religious legislation in this country, should arouse every liberty-loving citizen to a sense of danger, and set him to work to enlighten others in regard to National Reform designs and practices.*AMS November 1888, page 88.17*

Senator Blair may be, as the *Tribune* intimates, a harmless “crank,” but there are many thousands afflicted with the same religious-legislation mania, and there is a dangerous method in their madness. We cannot afford to settle down in fancied security when such measures are being seriously proposed in the Senate of the United States.*AMS November 1888, page 88.18*

The *California Christian Advocate* some weeks ago gravely informed its readers that “Congressman Plumb, of Kansas, has offered an amendment to the Sunday Civil Bill providing an appropriation for the building of a public drinking fountain in the

Capitol.” Of course the bill to which the Kansas Congressman has offered an amendment is the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill; but in these days of proposed Sunday legislation it is perhaps not strange that the friends of Sunday laws fail to discern what to them seems so small a difference. The time may come, however, when even the Sundry Appropriation Bill may contain clauses relative to Sunday, and then it will indeed be literally the “Sunday Civil Bill.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.19*

Not long since a Prohibition Convention was held in Visalia, Cal. The preachers were very active and enthusiastic in it; and they succeeded in arousing a good deal of enthusiasm in the body of the convention. After the convention had dispersed the following question was put to two of the preachers: “I suppose the object of this is, in the long run, to work it into a Sunday law?” And the answer was this:-*AMS November 1888, page 88.20*

“That is what it is; but we are not saying anything about that now, till we get the thing in running order-then we will bring that in.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.21*

That is precisely the scheme which the preachers are working through the third-party-Prohibition movement, and that is just the way that they are working it. Under cover of Prohibition and temperance legislation they are working for the establishment of a religious despotism.*AMS November 1888, page 88.22*

In a speech in Boston on “The Prospects of Catholicism in the United States,” Dr. Daniel Dorchester (Methodist) said:*AMS November 1888, page 88.23*

“Some people have been very anxious lest the Pope should come to this country. But I say, Let him come; it is the best thing that could be done. And I really think I would attempt to raise money to buy 10,000 acres of the best land in the United States, and make him a present of it for the seat of his Government. But when he comes here, he will be a great deal less of a man than he is at Rome.”*AMS November 1888, page 88.24*

No, he would not. If the Pope should come here, with the politicians, and the Protestant ecclesiastics ambitious of civil power, he would

soon be the head of the Nation in all matters of advice and arbitration-he would virtually soon be the dictator. See the influence of Cardinal Gibbons. But if it is thus with only a Cardinal, what would it not be with the Pope? No, indeed; let not the Pope ever set foot in the United States.*AMS November 1888, page 88.25*

December 1888

“The Papacy in Germany” American Sentinel 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

There was a Catholic Congress lately held in Freiburg, Germany, which showed the determination of the Papacy to push every claim to its utmost limit. The Congress demanded the return of all the orders of the church into Germany, with permission for all of them to labor there without hindrance. It demanded also that the State give up the sole control of the schools, and give to the church a share in their supervision and direction. It further formulated a demand for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. The *Germania*, the leading Catholic periodical of Germany, backs up the work of the Congress with the following:-*AMS December 1888, page 89.1*

“That which the shameless monk of Wittenberg inaugurated three hundred and fifty years ago is no longer looked upon as a reformation. No; it was a rushing into a bottomless pit. It is the most flagrant, the most radical, the most wicked revolution which the world has ever seen. It was a revolution in the churchly, the religious, the moral, the political, the social, the economic, the learned, the historical worlds. The foundation of the so-called Evangelical Church has long since been understood by intelligent men. According to these, Protestantism is nothing but a mere rejection of all and everything that is supernatural; it explains everything on the basis of the law of nature, of natural development, and not even the smallest nook is left open for the God of revelation. Its foundations are the purest godlessness and religious nihilism; and on such a foundation only hate and empty words, only decay and destruction, in time and eternity, can be built.”*AMS December 1888, page 89.2*

All this only goes to show the determination of the Papacy to re-establish her power everywhere by every means. And this evil leaven is working in the United States as well as in Europe.*AMS December 1888, page 89.3*

“One Pope or Many?” American Sentinel 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

A friendly critic, who is a diligent reader of the Sentinel, and who has often written both criticisingly and approvingly, writes us a letter in which he says:-*AMS December 1888, page 90.1*

“Don't be too sure that Protestant censorship of moral education in our schools will be 'scarcely less bearable' than Catholic censorship. Dr. Schaff includes the 'laymen' in his committee. I can stand a censor of my own choosing. I am willing to accept a censor chosen by the people. I can stand the tyranny of the people, but not the tyranny of the Pope or king. The tyranny of the latter is life-long; that of the people is soon corrected.”*AMS December 1888, page 90.2*

“I agree with you on the main issue against Joseph Cook and his Reform Association. But we must waive some of our preferences in the education of our children, for the sake of unity and homogeneity, the same as we waive some of our natural liberty for the sake of good order and good government.”*AMS December 1888, page 90.3*

“‘The consent of the governed’-that is the jewel that must be preserved. Consent is the foundation of Protestant censorship. Dictation is the foundation of Catholic censorship. The judgment of every man has a voice in the former. The selfish judgment of one man controls the latter. These facts should ever be kept in view in the examination of Papal education and Protestant education. The supreme question is, Shall the people be sovereign over morals and religion? or shall the Pope?”*AMS December 1888, page 90.4*

“I am for putting the Bible into the schools if thereby we can strengthen the sovereignty of the people.”*AMS December 1888, page 90.5*

This language is the more significant from the fact that our friend declares himself to be an infidel. That such sentiments should be held by an avowed infidel, who is an intelligent, thinking man, a lawyer, is exceedingly suggestive of the case with which National Reform, falsely so called, may some day count among its defenders those who claim to be the champions of liberty and “free thought.”

From other letters that we have received, as well as from utterances through the press, we are confident that there are many professed infidels who are preparing, perhaps unconsciously to themselves, to fall in with National Reform ideas.*AMS December 1888, page 90.6*

We are more than ever convinced that the only true liberty, and the only real freedom of thought and action, are found in the religion of Jesus Christ, as proclaimed by the great Teacher himself. There can be no free man except the one whom the truth makes free, -the truth as it is in Christ. We would have all men know that the true religion of Christ stands for the most perfect liberty; that it is the only real champion of human liberty. To be a Christian is to be free, and to be an earnest laborer for the fullest freedom of every individual. And no other man than the Christian can be in the fullest sense a champion of liberty. Hence it is that we do not rejoice so greatly as some others do at the opposition of infidels to National Reform. Knowing that they do not oppose it from the proper standpoint, we feel assured that those who do not become converted to Jesus Christ, will ere long be zealous champions of that which they now imagine that they despise.*AMS December 1888, page 90.7*

Tyranny is tyranny, no matter who exercises it. For our part, if we must be slaves, we think it would be far preferable to be the slaves of one man than the slaves of a million men. But we protest against being enslaved at all. Freedom is more than life; without it life is nothing. Thousands of martyrs have testified to this with their blood. Slavery, whether of body or soul, is abhorrent to every principle of Christianity; and slavery of the soul and the conscience is so much worse than slavery of the body, that the latter is not to be named in connection with the former, except as a very feeble comparison. Thousands of slaves toiling in the fields or the galleys under the lash, and in chains, have been free men-infinitely freer than their brutal masters. The man who is "holden with the cords of his sins," or whose conscience is in the keeping of another or of thousands of others, is an abject slave. The man to whom God has given intellect, who will allow any other, or others, to do his thinking for him, or to dictate to him in matters of faith and conscience, has no right to call himself a free man.*AMS December 1888, page 91.1*

And the evil is not lessened, but rather augmented, when that

slavery is voluntary. "The consent of the governed" is a fine phrase, but it may stand for the most degraded slavery as well as the most perfect liberty. Is a woman's shame any the less because she consents to be the slave of lust? If she willingly sells or gives away her chastity, is not her slavery the more deplorable? The slave who groans in unwilling bondage is next door to liberty; but what hope is there for the one who forges the shackles for his own limbs, and willingly consents and even begs to have placed upon him the badge of servitude?*AMS December 1888, page 91.2*

No man has a right to consent to waive his judgment in matters that pertain to conscience. God has delegated to no man on earth the right to demand that another shall give assent to a thing which he believes to be wrong. And what is not delegated to any man on earth, certainly cannot be held by a million. This is not anarchy, but, on the contrary, is in most perfect harmony with strict obedience to law; for our friend is mistaken in supposing that good order and good government require that we should waive a particle of our natural liberty. Perfect liberty is found in a state where each individual is careful not to injure his neighbor, and it is not consonant with any other state. When any man goes beyond and defrauds his neighbor, the imprisonment which he suffers upon conviction by the civil law, is only the outward manifestation of the bondage in which he placed himself by the commission of his crime, long before the law placed its hand upon him. Perfect liberty is perfect conformity to perfect law; and the law which demands that the humblest citizen should waive any of his God-given rights in order to conform to it, is an unjust law; and perfect conformity to an unjust law is slavery,-slavery on the part of the majority who conform to it because they have made it, and it suits their inclinations, even more than on the part of the one who is forced to it against his will.*AMS December 1888, page 91.3*

We love unity and peace; but we hope that God may ever give us strength to fight against unity and peace that are secured by coercing a single individual to give up an inalienable right.*AMS December 1888, page 91.4*

The supreme question is not, Shall the people be sovereign over morals and religion? or shall the Pope? That question means simply

this: Shall the majority have power to dictate to the minority what they shall believe, and what shall constitute their religion? It means, Shall we have many popes or one Pope? The supreme question is, Shall God be recognized as sovereign over morals and religion? The American Sentinel's answer to this question is, Yes; and it will never recognize any other sovereign. Its highest ambition is to be instrumental in bringing many others to make the same acknowledgement.*AMS December 1888, page 91.5*

It is true that the proposed Protestant censor-ship includes laymen; but a pope is a pope even though he be uncrowned. We would as soon be dictated to in matters of conscience by priests and ministers as by laymen. We wish it distinctly understood that what we protest against is not the arrogation of power in matters of morals and religion by a particular class of men, but against the assumption of such power by anybody whatever.*AMS December 1888, page 91.6*

Our fight is not against a certain individual's wielding the lash, but against the wielding of the lash by anybody.*AMS December 1888, page 91.7*

It may not be amiss to note that laymen have ever been used as tools by a bigoted and Pharisaic priesthood. When the laity depends upon the ministry to tell them what they should believe, what possible difference can there be between being dictated to by a layman and being dictated to by a priest?*AMS December 1888, page 91.8*

Finally, in noting the last sentence of our friend's letter, we declare that we are against the teaching of the Bible in the public schools, for the simple reason that thereby the sovereignty of faith and morals will be placed in the hands of the majority, and the few will be deprived of their God-given liberty; because such a proceeding will put man in the place of God, and thus the only object of studying the Bible will be defeated. In short, we are unalterably opposed to unchristian methods of spreading Christianity, because when the result has been accomplished by such methods, we have the equivalent of the Papacy, and not true Christianity.*AMS December 1888, page 91.9*

E.J.W.

“Prohibition Blasphemy” American Sentinel 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The following article we clipped from the *Free Press*, Mankato, Minn., of October 12, 1888. The election is past, and the contest for the present is decided, but so far as we are concerned the matter here given is worth as much now as it was before election, as it is with principles that we have to do and not with parties as such. We heartily indorse every word of the *Free Press* in its rebuke of this piece of blasphemy. This exploit of the Wisconsin Prohibitionist is a sample of the kind of political contest that is, and will be, carried on by that party which Miss Willard declares is to be “the party of God.” Whoever has any respect for God or for himself had better separate himself as far as possible from the religious Prohibition party, its methods and its aims. The *Press* says:-*AMS December 1888, page 92.1*

“There are no doubt many conscientious and estimable people in the Prohibition party, whose moral convictions prompt them to vote with that party as the best way to express their disapproval of intemperance. Such of these as still believe they are not misrepresented and disgraced by the methods of fanatical leaders and workers, we would ask to read the following stupid and blasphemous production, which belongs and should be credited to the Wisconsin Prohibitionist, in which it was published as a prominent editorial on September 27. It is alleged to be a quotation from the ‘Bishop’s Book of Common Prayer,’ and is given to ridicule the declaration of Bishop Newman, of the M. E. Church, that he considers that ‘the supreme duty is to place the Government in the hands of Harrison and Morton,’ and that ‘I vote as I pray and pray as I vote.’ This Wisconsin organ of a party which is always lauding itself as the friend of ‘God and home,’ and repeatedly exhorts its members to vote as they pray, blasphemes God and disgraces itself by ridiculing the sacredness of prayer, and publishes the following as uttered by Bishop Newman:-*AMS December 1888, page 92.2*

“O Lord, thou knowest that I have had about as much attention from the Republican party as it is the good lot of any Methodist minister to receive; and thou knowest also that no man who has enjoyed these privileges can leave the party without being called a sorehead, a traitor, and a sniveling hypocrite; and yet it does look tough for a man of my standing to vote the same ticket with tens of thousands of saloon thugs and bloody brewers and distillers. It does look hard, as I before remarked, to see a Methodist bishop voting with such low-down and vicious pluguglies, thugs, and guttersnipes, to continue a traffic that pulls more men down to hell in one day than I ever converted in all my life. And yet, O Lord, thou knowest the fix I am in. Help me to make the people to truly see that both I, and Sheridan Shook, and Benjamin Harrison, and Peter Iler, and Capt. Pabst, and Buffalo Miller, and “Bloody Corner” Cox, and Schlitz, and Val Blatz, and Boss Quay, and tens of thousands of other whisky men, and several other good people, do heartily sympathize with all wise and well-directed efforts for the promotion of temperance and morality; and to Harrison and the Republican party be all the glory, forever. Amen!’ *AMS December 1888, page 92.3*

“We submit that among the lowest ranks of journalism there is still enough respect for religion and the teachings of Christ to prevent them from becoming the subjects of unnecessary jest and ridicule. It was left for an organ of the great ‘morality’ party to descend to the lowest depths, and insult all decency and outward respect for the sacredness of religion by an abortive attempt to secure weapons to defend the party it disgraces. It is about time for self-respecting, thinking men who have connection with the Prohibition political party to sever their ties to an organization which develops such disgraceful, uncalled-for methods as this clipping discloses.” *AMS December 1888, page 92.4*

Amen and Amen, say we. *AMS December 1888, page 92.5*

“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and Politics” American Sentinel 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The Sentinel has sometimes been accused of antagonizing the good work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and of turning aside from its legitimate work to fight that body. This charge we most emphatically deny. With the good work of the W.C.T.U., we are most heartily in accord; but just to the extent that it allies itself with so-called National Reform, and belies its name by becoming a political union, to that extent we are opposed to it. That is, we are opposed to it only when it neglects its own work. But in order that criticism may be turned from us, we publish the following from one of the most talented leaders in the National W.C.T.U. No words of ours have ever equaled it in scathing criticism, although it is justly deserved. The article is from the pen of Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, in the *Independent*, of November 1:-*AMS December 1888, page 93.1*

Permit a brief recital of the position of the W.C.T.U. on the much debated question of politics. The essential elements of religious truth upon which this organization is based are total abstinence, and Christian unity in advocating it. The leading characteristics of this movement have been the education of individuals as to personal duty, and the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors by legal enactments. This second phase of the question (work for prohibition) is not an end but a means to an end. This means is, however, so closely related to the end as to be sometimes substituted for it.*AMS December 1888, page 93.2*

Brought into prominence by reason of more manifest connection with the duties of citizenship, the political phases of the question have very largely absorbed the vital forces of the movement. During the last few years an effort has even been made to bend all these forces into the line of party action alone. The doctrine has been boldly announced that effort, unless made by a party, was valueless for good, and all agitation and discussion on these lines has had its bias set in a party mould. A frenzy seems to have possessed the souls of men, and nothing of good or beauty is seen in anything but the work of partisanship with all its attendant curses. Doctrines subversive of the duties of citizens have been freely taught, and lessons which logically result in anarchy and discord have been readily set. The most willing students of these lessons have been the women of the W.C.T.U. Their zeal has outrun that of their

brothers; it has had less of knowledge and more of religious fervor, and consequently been far more dangerous. It has made direct assaults upon the Christian character and political integrity of its own protesting membership, and has weakened its own hold upon the Christian public. The W.C.T.U. of to-day differs widely from the inspirational movement of the crusade or the early years which immediately followed.*AMS December 1888, page 93.3*

We do not claim that lines of Christian effort have been abandoned. The children are still gathered in the Bands of Hope, and taught the truth of total abstinence; prisons are still visited with words of blessing, anointed with flowers and tears; daughters are still taught the charm of social abstinence, and mothers are admonished of the obligations and the possibilities of the home. In all the forty departments work still goes on, but these all are overshadowed by the turbid smoke of party frenzy, and the malarial mists of party Jesuitism.*AMS December 1888, page 93.4*

No woman enjoys the official patronage who publicly antagonizes the political policy of the Union; no evangelist is sent out who is not in sympathy with the party work; no one is indorsed as a national organizer who declares her opposition to this policy. The official organ is a pronounced partisan paper. Like other partisan papers, it reports news and facts so as to make for their side. The paper for the work among foreign-born citizens is a party campaign paper during this year. The edition of the *Union Signal* for State and county fair work was made to bristle with arguments in favor of Prohibition party work.*AMS December 1888, page 93.5*

The blight of partisanship is upon everything, and women who expect to purify politics lend themselves to insinuations and half statements of truth for party effect as readily as the veriest demagogues in the old political parties which they condemn.*AMS December 1888, page 93.6*

This course has driven the women to great inconsistencies and many illogical positions. They talk about opposing "sweet reasonableness to severe epithet;" they make "gentle and dignified denial of any wrong intent toward any of our number," and then proceed to adopt with applause, charges (evidence of which is

withheld) against the personal integrity of a sister whom they profess to love and honor. They formally declare the most slanderous-insinuations of their willing press to be characterized by "Christian courtesy." Their president commended to her followers as "spicy reading," an open letter containing a most brutal attack upon a Christian minister, and which also contained insinuations against the character of a "beloved sister." Against such treatment there is no redress, since the code of Christian courtesy has swept away the ancient rule, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.*AMS December 1888, page 93.7*

They indulge in tumultuous applause at the name and presence of third-party candidates, but their president declares that sooner than support Warner Miller in his present candidacy in New York, "Let the minions of that accursed business (saloon) elect their candidates and so fill up the measure of their wrath." To-day those same minions know that the influence of this Christian organization in the vital issues to be settled on November 6 will strengthen the opposition to the man who has answered the challenge of the saloons by saying he preferred defeat to success due to saloon influence.*AMS December 1888, page 93.8*

The question is often asked: "Is not the minority as intensely partisan as the majority? Is not Mrs. Foster, an active Republican, as earnest in her platform advocacy of Republican doctrines, and as trusted in the counsels of party managers, and as responsible for Republican methods in dealing with the temperance question, as is Miss Willard for the third party?"*AMS December 1888, page 93.9*

To this we reply: "Mrs. Foster is earnest in her belief and advocacy of Republicanism; possibly as trusted in the temperance counsels of Republicans, and she willingly shares the responsibility of the general trend of Republicanism on the temperance question. The difference between her position and that of Miss Willard is, that her Republican party work is done as an individual; she does not attempt to coerce the opinion or the influence of the organization to these party ends." Miss Willard does, in her official capacity, support the third party; she goes in person to local conventions, and pleads for this party alliance; she gives official approbation to representation of the W.C.T.U. in third party political conventions;

she is herself, by vote of the National W.C.T.U. Convention, a “consulting member” of the National Prohibition Committee; she uses the platform of the W.C.T.U. Convention in personal advocacy of the third party and its candidates; she herself introduces these gentlemen as the candidates of “our party.” This Mrs. Foster has never done. In Iowa, where the Republican party has warranted the largest approbation of temperance women, and where, if anywhere, the society would be justified in promising allegiance, there the W.C.T.U. has never given it; and Mrs. Foster has time and again declared it never could be done with her approval.*AMS December 1888, page 93.10*

To fail to see the difference between official action and individual action, reveals a lamentable condition of mental or moral obloquy. In the conflicts of modern civilization it argues pitiful imbecility not to possess political convictions, and it argues mental or moral cowardice not to advocate them. This is as true of women as of men, but the political immorality of the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union consists in its appropriation of the political influence of the minority against their protest. That influence was given to the organization to keep and to use, but not to assign to any political party.*AMS December 1888, page 93.11*

In civil courts to obtain money under false pretenses is “embezzlement,” and to divert funds from their assigned and constitutional uses is “fraud.” This is what the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union has done; the difference in honor being in favor of the embezzler; the grand larceny committed by this Christian organization being of heart and soul and home “influence,” while the embezzler merely steals material value.*AMS December 1888, page 93.12*

In the time of the Woman’s Temperance Crusade, through the prayers and Christian fortitude of these brave, devout women, there were reported scores of genuine conversions to Christ. We should like very much to see a report of the number of conversions effected through the political workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.*AMS December 1888, page 93.13*

“The Church and State, alias the Prohibition Party” American Sentinel 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The election is over, but since the third party Prohibition managers say that the Prohibition campaign has but just begun, the following incident showing the character of the so-called Prohibition movement, is as timely now as ever.*AMS December 1888, page 94.1*

The evening before election one of the editors of the Sentinel was with several others in a business office in Minneapolis, when a well-dressed and intelligent looking gentleman came in, and, after noting how many voters were present, laid upon the desk as many sealed envelopes, addressed, "To the voters." As the gentleman turned to go out, someone handed him a printed notice of a lecture that was to be delivered that evening on "Church and State." He took in the contents of the handbill at a glance, and, hastily assuming from the most prominent words upon it, that the lecture was to favor the union of Church and State, said: "Church and State; that means Prohibition; we're with you on that."*AMS December 1888, page 94.2*

The Prohibition politician was gone before anybody could disabuse his mind as to the nature of the proposed lecture on Church and State; but those who remained received a better idea of the real object of the so-called Prohibition party, than could have been gained by a week's talk. The remark that Church and State is synonymous with Prohibition was so spontaneous and so hearty that it could not fail to convince all who heard it. We wished that thousands of Sentinel readers could have heard it for themselves, but this is an exact statement of the matter.*AMS December 1888, page 94.3*

Let everybody be assured that work done for party Prohibition is work done to promote the union of Church and State, and to bind the citizens of the United States in a worse slavery than was ever suffered by the negroes. We cannot any longer in good conscience call the third party the Prohibition party, for temperance is by no means its main issue. Chairman Dickie himself declared that all the saloons and intemperance in the land are not so great a curse as the disfranchisement of women. So we are justified in saying that

no one who has the cause of temperance and real liberty at heart, can train with the third party. It is not a Prohibition party, but a Church and State party, and strong opposition to it is perfectly consistent with the greatest devotion to true temperance and prohibition.*AMS December 1888, page 94.4*

There is a good suggestion in the following: "When a man sets about an undertaking, he should first have settled these four things- what he wants to do, why he wants to do it, whether he has the right to do it, and how it can best be done."*AMS December 1888, page 94.5*

"Back Page" American Sentinel 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

Read the Sentinel this month from beginning to end, if you never did before. You cannot afford to lose any of it.*AMS December 1888, page 96.1*

There are many things which we find on our table, which should be noticed this month, but lack of time and space forbid. Questions have been sent that should have immediate answer in the Sentinel, but which must be deferred until next month. The field is widening, and we could easily fill two Sentinels every month.*AMS December 1888, page 96.2*

The next National Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is to be held in San Francisco, in October, 1889. It is expected that five hundred delegates will be present. We shall be much interested to see how far they have progressed during the year, in the line of party politics and National Reform.*AMS December 1888, page 96.3*

For the benefit of several who have made inquiries, we will state that Senator Blair is from New Hampshire, and is a Republican. It is also true that he, like many other Republicans, and Democrats also, is a prohibitionist. That is, he believes in prohibiting the liquor traffic, but does not, as yet, believe in separate party action for that purpose. His introduction of the Sunday bill was an individual

matter, and cannot be considered as committing his party to any such policy.*AMS December 1888, page 96.4*

We have received several very appreciative letters lately, which are a source of great encouragement to us. Some of these have been from men professing to be infidels. We are sure that there are scores and hundreds of infidels to-day who were made so by false teaching concerning the Scriptures, and by being made to feel, by the actions of professed Christians, that the Bible sanctions injustice. The mission of the Sentinel is to uphold perfect liberty, and to show that true liberty can be found nowhere else excepting in the Bible and Christianity. In consequence of this, we expect to see many avowed infidels renounce their opposition to the Bible, and become free men indeed. That men might know the truth and be made free by it, is our most earnest desire.*AMS December 1888, page 96.5*

In his report to the *Christian Statesman* of November 15, Secretary Weir says:-*AMS December 1888, page 96.6*

"It was my privilege to speak, October 9, to the R.P. Presbytery of Pittsburg, on their invitation. The subject treated was the latest development of the National Reform movement, viz., in the line of practical politics, pressing its principles upon the various political parties for adoption."*AMS December 1888, page 96.7*

"October 11 the Pennsylvania W.C.T.U. gave opportunity to briefly speak on the same phase of the movement, and to ask their help. It was one of the experiences indeed to speak before a thousand Christian women. They unanimously adopted a resolution affirming National Reform principles as applicable to civil and political affairs, asking the women of their Unions to urge them on the various political parties.*AMS December 1888, page 96.8*

"To give effect to this, and to forward our principles in general, they created a new department-that of National Reform. This of course means a State superintendent for it, and county and local officers, just as in other departments. What opportunities will this give for mutual co-operation, distributing our literature, arranging for lectures or sermons, conventions, etc., as well as carrying the discussion of our principles just where it is so grievously needed,

before the political parties.”*AMS December 1888, page 96.9*

Facts speak for themselves. It does not need a prophet to tell just what the W.C.T.U. of Pennsylvania, at least, is running into.*AMS December 1888, page 96.10*

The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to make Christ “this world's king; yea, verily this world's king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions.” But Christ himself declared, “My kingdom is not of this world.” Therefore it follows that the kingdom which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish in this world is not the kingdom of Christ at all, but if established will be but a counterfeit of it, and that will be only a likeness of the Papacy. Christ says, “My kingdom is not of this world;” the Woman's Christian Temperance Union says, “Christ shall be this world's king;” therefore the word of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is flatly against the word of Christ, and therefore that part of the work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is antichristian.*AMS December 1888, page 96.11*

The *Christian Statesman* doubtless rejoices to be able to print the following:-*AMS December 1888, page 96.12*

“The Eighth District Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention, at Augusta, Wis., October 2, 3 and 4, passed this resolution:-*AMS December 1888, page 96.13*

“Whereas, God would have all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father; and,*AMS December 1888, page 96.14*

Whereas, The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai is the only perfect law that will secure the rights of all classes; therefore,*AMS December 1888, page 96.15*

“*Resolved*, That civil government should recognize Christ as the moral Governor, and his law as the standard of legislation.”*AMS December 1888, page 96.16*

Comment seems almost unnecessary, and all we will say at this

time is that the above is of the low view of the law of God that is held, and must of necessity be held, by National Reformers. The law given from Sinai was not a civil law. If it were a civil law, why would it require to be administered by a moral governor? If the law of God could be the standard in civil legislation, then it would cease to be the wonderful law that it is. But the thing which we wish to have remembered is the adoption of National Reform principles by the W.C.T.U.*AMS December 1888, page 96.17*

About a year ago the School Board of Pittsburg, Pa., made a Catholic priest principal of one of the city schools; but as there was much stir made about it, the priest retired from the position. It appears now, however, that he only let go to get a better hold; for the Catholics have now established a parochial school in the same public-school building. The dispatches say that the Protestants protest; but they cannot consistently protest for two reasons: 1. They demand that religion shall be taught in the public schools, and that is what the Catholics are teaching in that school-it seems to be a fact also that the children in that ward are almost wholly Catholic. 2. Christianity is the established religion of the State of Pennsylvania, and as even Protestants admit that the Catholic Church is a part of Christianity, that church has a right to claim the help of the State in teaching the State religion. There is a real need that there should be some Protestants in Pennsylvania who should protest, but whenever it is done, the protest will have to be against Protestantism itself as well as against Catholicism.*AMS December 1888, page 96.18*

The following, from the November number of Our Day, Joseph Cook editor-in-chief, should be noted by those who think that Church and State union is not possible in this country:-*AMS December 1888, page 96.19*

"Five million signatures to a petition to Congress for laws promoting a better observance of Sunday have now been obtained. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention have voted to make the advancement of this petition a special and urgent work. The most influential indorsement which the petition against Sunday work in the mail and military service and in interstate commerce has yet received was given unanimously and

enthusiastically on October 18, at Richmond, Va., by the International Convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, after two hours' thorough consideration of the subject, under the lead of the editor of our department of Church Work [Rev. W. F. Crafts]. Let all labor organizations, large and small, and all churches, do likewise speedily, and the desired law will not be long in coming. Churches and labor unions combined are politically irresistible." *AMS December 1888, page 96.20*

But let it be borne in mind that when churches become politically irresistible, they are spiritually powerless, for they never seek political strength until they become conscious of diminishing moral force. *AMS December 1888, page 96.21*

